RGVEDADI- BHASYA
BHUMIKA

ṚGVEDĀDI-BHĀṢYA-BHŪMIKĀ

SVĀMĪ DAYĀNANDA SARASVATĪ'S

ṚGVEDĀDI-BHĀṢYA-BHŪMIKĀ

BEING

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMENTARY
ON THE FOUR VEDAS

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH
with original text, a critical introduction & exhaustive notes
by

PARMANAND
Ph.D., P.E.S.

Sole Distributors

MEHARCHAND LACHHMANDAS

Sale-Depot : INDRA STREET, 1 ANSARI ROAD
DARYAGANJ, NEW DELHI-110002
(INDIA)

Published by :

MEHARCHAND LACHHMANDAS PUBLICATIONS
1 Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi-110002

First edition, 1981

Printed at :

V. V. R. I. Press
P. O. Sadhu Ashram
Hoshiarpur (Punjab)

In the sacred
memory of my revered father
PANDIT PARASHURAM
—the embodiment of Vedic Dharma

PREFACE

Svāmī Dayānanda's supreme effort in life was to give back to the world the Vedas, the ancient treasure-house of Divine Knowledge. He had taken a long and deep immersion into the perennial stream which quenched his thirst and filled his soul with indescribable solace. He had wandered long and far and wide in dismay before he visioned the light, the light of true and virgin Dharma, as revealed in the Vedas. He was a *parivrājaka* (a homeless preacher-prince), and the whole humanity was his congregation. He declared that the Vedas were for the lowliest of the low and for the highest of the high. They were the fountain-head from which flowed the nectar of eternal virtue and true knowledge in a never-dying stream to slake the thirst of all the children—the babes and the grown-ups of the Divine Mother. To this fountain-head of peace and purity he invited the misguided mankind and asked them to quench their thirst. This was his mission and for this he lived and died.

As a transparent and pure stream flowing from the silver-white snows gets adulterated in its downward march with muddy streamlets and dirty drains which pollute its purity, so had this eternal stream of Divine Lore become polluted with streamlets of diverse human errors. Dayānanda saw this and saw even much more. There had been commentators and interpreters who had grossly misinterpreted the Veda. It was, therefore, his mission to interpret the Veda in a proper and genuine manner.

Vedic scholarship in India, in the true sense of the term, appears to have ceased with the great work of Yāska — the *Nirukta*. In fact, among the ancient Vedic commentaries, only the Brāhmaṇas and the *Nirukta* have come down to us. That there were other works is amply proved by the fact that Yāska mentions several of them. The commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Skanda, Veṅkaṭa, Mahīdhara, etc., are of recent times. All of them belong to a time later than Yāska's. According to Dayānanda these commentaries were gross misinterpretations. He based his commentary on the Brāhmaṇas and the *Nirukta* and rejected all other commentaries. His interpretations are based mainly on the etymological method.

All this explains the importance of Dayānanda and his great work, the *Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā*, which I am presenting to the English-

knowing people in the garb of English. I am sure the modern Vedic scholar in India as well as in other countries will be benefited greatly by this work.

The present work has been undertaken with a twofold object: first, to assist the critical scholars as well as the laymen in their studies of the Vedas, particularly its theme and method of interpretation; and secondly, to furnish them with the technical, historical and other cognate matters, relevant to their critical and comparative study.

The introductory part embodies information of general character. It also contains discussions on the problems which hitherto have remained in some respects untouched and untraced by the scholars. Some of the topics which involve endless controversies in the modern Vedic scholarship have also been critically examined so as to show the merits and demerits of Dayānanda's method of interpretation of the Veda.

So far the Vedas were read and understood in India and in occident as they were interpreted by Sāyaṇa and others or by occidental scholars (i.e., partly in accordance with the so-called traditional method of interpretation offered by Europeans). But the true Indian point of view remained unknown hitherto in India as well as abroad. A sincere effort in this direction has been made here for the first time.

It may be stated here that a chapter on the life and teachings of Svāmī Dayānanda, based on all available biographies written by various scholars, including Gopal Rao Hari, the contemporary author of *Digvijayārka*, Lekh Ram, Devendra Nath Mukerjee, Bawa Chhajju Singh, Lala Lajpat Rai and others, has been appended at the end (pp. 462-88) for the curious readers. It has been kept brief but I could not resist the temptation of giving the accounts of events (and also adding new facts) as given by Lala Lajpat Rai, the devout disciple of Svāmī Dayānanda and the great martyr of India's liberation. I have also reproduced, in original (pp. 476-79), the article which was published in the *Christian Intelligencer* in 1870, detailing the whole account of the *śāstrārtha* (disputation) held in Varanasi in November, 1869 between all the *paṇḍitas* of Kāśī on one side and Dayānanda alone on the other,. The writer of this article was a Christian missionary who himself was present there. This valuable piece of evidence is still preserved in the library of Church Missionary Society in London.

The second part is the English translation of the *Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā* from the original Sanskrit which Dayānanda wrote before writing the commentary on the four Vedas. This work is much more voluminous than Sāyaṇa's introduction to the *Ṛg-bhāṣya*. It covers 400 closely

printed pages and contains exhaustive discussions on topics which could not be even imagined by Sāyaṇa.

Dayānanda's *Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā* is a unique work in the field of Vedic scholarship. Almost all Vedic works and other scriptural and philosophical treatises in Sanskrit have been quoted in this work. It contains more than one thousand citations from all spheres of Sanskrit literature, including three hundred verses from the Vedas.

It was not an easy job to translate such a technical work into English. I may add here that Dayānanda has interpreted many verses and citations from the Vedic literature in his own way, quite differently from the generally accepted conceptions and interpretations, and has drawn radically different conclusions. I have remained faithful to him and have tried to convey to the reader what our author aimed at. I am conscious that my translation is only an humble attempt and is open to criticism at many places, but all the same, it is a very sincere effort to clearly convey the idea of the original to the reader. I have added exhaustive critical and comparative notes on controversial points. Thus it is not merely a faithful translation but a complete *bhāṣya* on the *Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā.* I venture to say that I have made efforts to explain the things and not merely to 'explain them away'.

In the end it is my pleasant duty to thank all scholars from whose works I have frequently quoted. I am sincerely thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Vishva Bandhu, Honorary Director of the Vishveshvarananda Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur (Punjab) for his encouragement and suggestions.

—Parmanand

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

ABBREVIATIONS

AB, AIB	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
AIU	Aitareya Upaniṣad.
AK	Amarakoṣa.
ALS	Āśvalāyana Sūtras.
APB	Āpastamba Sūtras.
AV	Atharvaveda.
BD	Bṛhaddevatā.
BG, BHG	Bhagavadgītā.
BH	Bhartṛhari Śatakatraya.
BP	Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa.
BU	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.
CHU	Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
DK	Daśakumāracarita.
GP	Gopatha Brāhmaṇa.
JU	Jaiminīya Uttarāraṇyaka.
JUB, JUNB	Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.
KD	Kālidāsa.
KP	Kāvyaprakāśa.
KS	Kumārasaṁbhava.
KSU	Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad.
KTU	Kaṭha Upaniṣad.
KU	Kena Upaniṣad.
LV	Līlāvatī.
MAL, MM	Mālavikāgnimitra.
MB	Mahābhāṣya.
MBH	Mahābhārata.
MD	Mīmāṁsā Darśana.
MDB	Mīmāṁsā Bhāṣya.
MK	Mṛcchakaṭika.
MMB	Mīmāṁsā Śābara Bhāṣya.
MNU	Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad.
MS	Manusmṛti.
MTR	Mitākśarā.
MTS	Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā.
MTU	Maitrī Upaniṣad.

MU	...	...	Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad.
MUU	...	...	Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad.
MVC	...	...	Mahāvīracarita.
N	...	...	Nirukta.
ND	...	...	Nyāya Darśana.
NS	...	...	Nītiśataka.
NTU	...	...	Nighaṇṭu.
NSM	...	...	Nyāya-Siddhānta-Muktāvali.
P	...	...	Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī.
PAR	...	...	Pāraskara Sūtra.
PL	...	...	Piṅgala Sūtra.
PNU	...	...	Prāṇāgni Upaniṣad.
PT	...	...	Pañcatantra.
PU	...	...	Praśna Upaniṣad.
R	...	...	Raghuvaṁśa.
RMN	...	...	Rāmāyaṇa.
RV	...	...	Ṛgveda.
Ś, S	...	...	Śākuntala.
SB	...	...	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.
SBH	...	...	Śārīraka Bhāṣya.
SD	...	...	Sāṅkhya Darśana.
SK	...	...	Siddhāntakaumudī.
SNB	...	...	Śāṅkhyāyana Brāhmaṇa.
SS	...	...	Sūrya Siddhānta.
SST	...	...	Suśruta Saṁhitā.
SU	...	...	Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.
SV	...	...	Sāmaveda.
TA	...	...	Taittirīya Āraṇyaka.
TB	...	...	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.
TS	...	...	Taittirīya Saṁhitā.
TU	...	...	Taittirīya Upaniṣad.
U	...	...	Uṇādi Sūtra.
URC	...	...	Uttararāmacarita.
VD	...	...	Vaiśeṣika Darśana.
VDD	...	...	Vedānta Darśana.
VP	...	...	Viṣṇu Purāṇa.
VS	...	...	Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā.
YD	...	...	Yoga Darśana.
YS	...	...	Yājñavalkya Smṛti.
YV	...	...	Yajurveda.

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

IMPORTANCE OF THE WORK

1. BACKGROUND OF THE NEW BHĀṢYA ON THE VEDAS

Ṛṣi Dayānanda called upon his countrymen "to go back to the Vedas" for eradicating all evils and ills of their society. It was his long meditated and well-founded conception that the cause of degradation and slavery of Indian nation was the ignorance of true Vedic teaching and the spread of the Paurāṇika culture and thoughts instead. Unless his countrymen again resorted and adhered to and followed the Vedic path, no progress was possible in social, political, economic, spiritual and religious spheres. Salvation lay only in adoption, acceptance and faithfully following the dynamic and radical ways of life as propounded in the Vedas.

But according to him the real and true significance and correct concept of the Vedas could not continue to remain in vogue after the great Mahābhārata war. True Vedic scholars and real interpreters of the Vedas, e.g., Yāska. etc., left the world, by and by, giving place to the confused and self-centred new type of priestly class who reserved the right of the Vedas to themselves only. Countless and conflicting religious cults, professing Vedic origin (without rightly studying the Vedas), appeared in our society. They began to kill and sacrifice cow, horse and even human beings in the Yajñas, e.g., Gomedha, Aśvamedha, Naramedha, and others. They forgot
where all types of Hiṁsā is forbidden. Drinking of wine, meat-eating (including beef) and illicit sexual intercourse, without sparing even sisters and mothers, in the so called "Bhairavī Cakra", were regarded as the ways of attainment of salvation by Vāma-Margins. Vedic stanzas were wrongly interpreted by them and others in support of their ill-conceived and selfish conceptions. Mahīdhara, Uvvaṭa and Sāyaṇa wrote commentaries on the Vedas under the influence of mystic cults of Tantras, Purāṇas and Vāma-Marga scriptures. This caused the birth of the Cārvāka sect, Buddhism and Jainism who rejected Vedic path (as known to them) and bitterly condemned it. Thus the long forgotten tradition of correct Vedic interpretation could not reach Sāyaṇa and others, and they interpreted the Vedas in the way opposed to the Brāhmaṇas and the Nirukta. In this way, the glory and dignity of the Vedic culture and its sublime principles were

lost. Oriental and Occidental Vedic scholars were led astray and they could not find out the real concept and true significance of the Vedas.

2. DAYĀNANDA'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION

Dayānanda laboured hard to churn out the nectar from the fathomless ocean of the Vedas. He dived deep and explored precious gems of Vedic secrets. He studied the Vedas intensively and perceived the light in deep meditations. He then assessed the value of Vedic import and light and wanted to ward off the eclipse of wrong interpretations from the Vedic Sun. In order to achieve this end, it was unavoidable for him to write a fresh and correct commentary on all the Vedas to frustrate and foil all blemishes of current commentaries which have grossly ill-interpreted the Vedas. He clearly says :—

येनाधुनिकभाष्यै: ये टीकाभि: वेद-दूषका: ।
दोषा: सर्वे विनश्येयु: अन्यथार्थ-विवर्णना: ।।
सत्यार्थंश्च प्रकाश्येत वेदानां य: सनातन: ।। (*Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmika*)

He, therefore, thought to compose a commentary on the Vedas on the lines of ancient Ṛṣis and Munis. He adds :—

आर्याणां मुन्यृषीणां या व्याख्यारीति: सनातनी ।
तां समाश्रित्य मन्त्रार्था विधास्यन्ते तु नान्यथा ।। (*Ibid.*)

But the time and circumstances were not favourable. It was an age when the Vedic texts were not easily available. Vedic scholars were rare. Study of the Vedas was not in vogue. Kāśī, the home of Sanskrit learning, was bereft of a real Vedic Paṇḍita. Large number of Vedic recensions (Śākhās) and the Brāhmaṇas had long disappeared. Even the actual Vedas were hardly to be found out in India. No state protection could be expected from the foreign British rule who wanted to propagate their own religion and culture in India. The royal patronage available even to Sāyaṇa and Hari Svāmin was a thing of the remote past. Vedic Paṇḍitas, who were easily available as help to Sāyaṇa and Skanda-Svāmin, had gone into oblivion. In such a tiring atmosphere Ṛṣi Dayānanda, because of his deep learning, penance and dedication, could muster a few faithful followers on whose scanty financial assistance he embarked on this most important and lavishly costly project of producing Veda-Bhāṣyas. For this highly dynamic and deeply patriotic adventure, he had to sacrifice his all, including his hard-earned Divine Bliss of meditation. He himself confirms it in his correspondence. He writes :—

हम ने केवल परमार्थ और स्वदेशोन्नति के कारण अपने समाधि और ब्रह्मानन्द को छोड़कर यह कार्य ग्रहण किया ।। (*Patra-Vyavahāra*, p. 280)

Curses of caste system, idolatry, untouchability, all types of superstitions and slaughtering of animals in the sacrifices, and even the human sacrifices (*Nara-medha*), were the results of wrong Vedic interpretations and thus the Hindus had to pay heavily for all these shortcomings. Ṛṣi Dayānanda's scientific interpretations on the Vedas inspired hope and courage in the nation and people began to feel proud of their rich heritage and lofty principles preached in the Vedas. India will remain indebted to this great sage for leading her to her glorious past.

3. IMPORTANCE OF THE ṚGVEDĀDI-BHĀṢYA-BHŪMIKĀ

We have already described the importance of this work in our Preface and would discuss this matter later at the proper place. It would suffice here to say that this work in our opinion occupies the uppermost place in all his works, because this book embodies detailed discussions on all the fundamental principles on which his Vedic commentary is based. If they are correct, authentic, logical and credible, and also if they are supported by valid and cognate evidences, the whole of his commentary on the Vedas is acceptable. But if these are not valid and are not credible, then not only his entire Veda-Bhāṣya is inadmissible but the whole structure of his entire mission and work would also be deemed baseless and will crumble down like a house of cards. Hence, this work is regarded supreme among all his works. This work is not an Introduction to the Commentary on the Ṛgveda only but it is related to all the four Vedas on which he intended to write Bhāṣyas. It is clearly indicated by the title of the work itself and is expressively confirmed by our author in the Bhāṣya on the Yajurveda—

और सब विषय भूमिका में प्रकट कर दिया । वहां देख लेना । क्योंकि उक्त भूमिका चारों वेदों की है । (p. 8)

"For all these topics the reader may refer to the said Bhūmikā because it is an introduction to all the four Vedas."

The fundamental and essentially primary important position of this great work is further indicated by the fact that Ṛṣi Dayānanda forbade the sale of his dynamic commentary on the Vedas to persons who wanted to purchase it alone without having first purchased this book. He, however, allowed the sale of this "Bhūmikā" without the actual Veda-Bhāṣya. It is clearly stated in the following advertisement published on the third and

fourth pages of the title cover of the Ṛgveda, and the Yajurveda Bhāṣyas, respectively—

> "जो कोई भूमिका के विना वेद हो केवल लिया चाहे सो नहीं मिल सकते । किन्तु भूमिका ५) देने से पृथक् मिल सकती है ।"[1]

4. PLACE AND DATE OF STARTING IT

Our author commenced writing this Bhūmikā during his stay in Ayodhyā. Devendra Nath mentions this fact in his *Biography of Svāmī Dayānanda* (Hindi) in the following words—

> भाद्रपद १४ सं० १९३३ वि० अर्थात् १८ अगस्त सन् १८७६ को स्वामी जी अयोध्या पहुँच कर सरयू बाग में चौधरी गुरु चरण लाल के मन्दिर में उतरे । अयोध्या में भाद्र शुक्ला प्रतिपदा सं० १९३३ विक्रम अर्थात् २० अगस्त १८७६ ई० को ऋग्वेदादि भाष्य भूमिका का लिखना प्रारम्भ हुआ ।[2]

5. THE WRITING OF BHASYA

Commencement

Maharṣi Dayānanda started writing his regular and running commentary on the Vedas, preceded by the Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā, from the first day of the lunar fortnight of Bhādrapada, 1933 of Vikrama era (20th August, 1876), and he mentions this date in the introductory verses of this work in the following words—

> कालरामाङ्कचन्द्रेऽब्दे (1933) भाद्रमासे सिते दले ।
> प्रतिपद्यादित्यवारे भाष्यारम्भः कृतो मया ॥[3]

> "I commenced writing this great commentary on Sunday, the first day of the bright half of the lunar month of Bhādrapada in the year 1933 (Vikram era)."

First Rough Draft

Approximately it took three months to finish the first rough draft of this work. But there is no clear or specific internal evidence in support of this theory. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka finds a reference to this effect

1. See, Bhagavaddatta, *Ṛṣi Dayānanda ke Patra Aur Vijñāpana*, (Second Edition), page 138.

2. Devendra Nath, *Ṛṣi Dayānanda kā Jīvana Charita*, page 375.

3. *The Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā*, verse 2.

in the following two advertisements, read together, dated bright half of Mārgaśīrṣa 15, Saṁvat 1933, issued by the author indicating the progress of his Veda Bhāṣya—

> (क) संवत् १९३३ वि० मार्गशीर्ष शुक्ला पूर्णमासी (१ दिसम्बर १८७६) पर्यन्त दश हजार श्लोकों का प्रमाण भाष्य बन गया है और कम से कम ५० श्लोक और अधिक से अधिक १०० श्लोक पर्यन्त प्रतिदिन भाष्य को रचते हैं।[1]
>
> (ख) सो भूमिका के श्लोक न्यून से न्यून संस्कृत और आर्य भाषा के मिला के आठ हजार हुए हैं। (*Patra-Vyavahāra*, pp. 40, 46)

It can be easily concluded from this statement that the author finished the first draft of his manuscript about tbe end of the first week of Mārgaśīrṣa, i.e. he took nearly 3 months to finish bis first draft of tbis work.

The book was revised and enlarged at least six times before a final press copy of tbe same was prepared, as is evident from the six different copies of manuscripts preserved in the office of the Paropakāriṇī Sabhā in Ajmer. The final version appears to bave come into existence on Saturday, the sixth day of tbe dark fortnigbt of Phālguṇa in 1933. This fact is corroborated from the following internal evidence from tbis book.

> जैसे विक्रम के संवत् १९३३ फाल्गुण मास, कृष्णपक्ष षष्ठी शनिवार के दिन चतुर्थ प्रहर के आरम्भ में यह (वेदोत्पत्ति की काल गणना की) बात हम ने लिखी है।[2]

From tbis statement it can be presumed that the work of finalising the press copy of tbe treatise was undertaken in tbe last week of Māgha or in the beginning of Pbālguṇa in 1933 (V. E.).

Date of Publication

It is not certain when the work of printing of this treatise was started. Tbe work was published not in one single volume at first but in 16 numbers (issues) out of wbich the first issue was printed at Lajras Press, Kāśī, and the year of publication is mentioned on its title

---

1. Yudhiṣṭbira Mīmāṁsaka, *Ṛṣi Dayānanda ke Granthoṅ kā Itihāsa*, page 97.

2. *Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā*, (Ram Lal Kapur Trust edition), page 28.

page as 1934 (V. E.). It also bears the following notification on its title page—

विदित हो कि सं० १९३४ वैशाख महीने में देश पंजाब के लुधियाना वा अमृतसर में स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती जी निवास करेंगे ।

It clearly indicates that the printing of this issue commenced in Phālguṇa, 1933 and the first volume came out in Caitra, 1934.

The last one volume of this treatise containing the 15th and 16th numbers was printed at the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay in Vaiśākha, 1935 (V. E.). Thus 13 months were spent in the printing of this work.

6. THE MANUSCRIPTS OF BHĀṢYA-BHŪMIKĀ

There are six manuscripts of the *Ṛgvedādi - Bhāṣya - Bhūmikā,* preserved in the office of the Paropakāriṇī Sabhā, Ajmer, which governs the Vedic Yantrālaya there. The press copy of the manuscript is not traceable now. It is presumed that the same might have been lost in the Lajras Press, Kāśī where the first edition of the work was mostly printed. We write below a brief description of the six available manuscripts—

Manuscript No. 1

It is complete and it contains Sanskrit text only. The paging is regular till the end. Eight pages dealing with grammatical rules are appended and after the 87th page four pages are added. Thus total pages are 147 (135+4+8=147). *Lines* : 32 lines per page and about 24 letters per line. *Paper* : Thin, blue in colour and ruled. Last eight pages are on thick hand-made paper. *Scribe* : The writing shows three different hands. Pp. 1 to 60, pp. 61 to 63 and p. 64 to the last page are in different hands. *Corrections* : The author made corrections in it in black and red inks here and there. 'Hartal' is also used at many places.

Manuscript No. 2

It also contains Sanskrit text only. It is also complete. *Pages* : 140. *Lines* : 30 or 32 on each page. *Letters* : About 24 letters per line. *Paper* : Superior, glazed, ruled, and blue upto page 31 ; thereafter, thick, glazed, white and indigenous. *Scribe* : Handwriting indicates 2 hands. *Corrections.* : In red ink and black pencil (and sometimes black ink) used by the author himself here and there for corrections.

Manuscript No. 3

Incomplete manuscript upto "Veda-Nityatva" only. It contains both Sanskrit and Hindi versions. *Pages* : 51. *Lines* : Approximately 16 per page. *Letters* : About 36 per line. *Paper* : Hand-made, thick aad white. *Corrections* : Only in the hand of the writer. 'Hartal' is also used sometimes.

Manuscript No. 4

(A) This manuscript has two portions. It is complete but the matter contained in pages 377 to 399 of the printed text is missing. It is only upto the topic on "Gaṇita Vidyā" and contains both Sanskrit and Hindi versions. *Pages* : 10 pages added after 147. Total 190 (180+10=190). *Lines* : About 16 per page. *Letters* : About 36 per line. *Paper* : Hand-made. *Corrections* : In red and black ink by the author himself.

(B) The second portion commences after the above stated topic. It has Hindi version only. *Pages* : 138 (Page 4 has wrongly been repeated). *Lines* : 26 per page. *Letters* : About 26 per line. *Paper* : Blue. *Scribe* : It is written in more than two hands. *Corrections* : Made by the author in black ink.

Manuscript No. 5

It has also two portions "A" and "B".

(A) *Pages* : 1 to 209. *Lines* : About ten per page. *Letters* : About 42 per line. *Paper* : White, thick, hand-made. *Scribe* : Written in many hands. *Corrections* : By the author himself.

(B) *Pages* : 112 to 322. *Lines* : About 26 per page. *Letters* : About 42 per line. *Paper* : Blue and ruled. *Scribe* : Many hands. *Corrections* : Done by the author himself in a large number of cases.

Manuscript No. 6

Complete from beginning to end. *Pages* : 410. *Lines* : About 27 per page. *Letters* : About 24 per line. *Paper* : Blue and thick. *Scribe* : Written in many hands. *Corrections* : Corrected by the author himself in a large number of cases, but it has scribes' corrections also.

It may be noted here that none of the six manuscripts is a press copy, which might have been lost either in Lajras Press or Nirṇaya Sāgara Press where the first edition of the book was printed in parts. Thus, there were seven manuscripts in all, including the final press copy of this book.

7. THE PRINTED EDITIONS OF BHĀṢYA

There are four publishers of this great work, namely (1) The Vedic Yantrālaya, Ajmer of the Paropakāriṇī Sabhā founded by Svāmī Dayānanda himself; (2) M/s. Govind Ram Hasa Nand, Delhi; (3) The Ārya Sāhitya Maṇḍal, Ajmer; and (4) Shri Ram Lal Kapur Trust, Amritsar. Each of them brought out a number of editions. I shall examine them very briefly as under :

I. Edition of Vedic Yantrālaya of Paropakāriṇī Sabhā

(a) **The Lajras Press, and** (b) **The Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press :** The first edition of the work was not published by any of the above-cited agencies. It was not published in one single volume, but in 16 partial issues, out of which the first 14 numbers were got printed by the author himself at Lajras Press, Kāśī, and the 15th and the 16th at the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay. The title page of the first number of the book is dated as 1934 (V. E.) and also bears the following notification at the bottom of the page indicating the plausible date of publication :

> "विदित हो कि सं० १९३४ वैशाख महीने में देश पञ्जाब लुधियाना वा अमृतसर में स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती जी निवास करेंगे ॥"

It is clear from this that the work of printing of this issue was probably started in Phālguṇa, 1933 and the first issue was out in Caitra, 1934. The last volume containing both the 15th and the 16th numbers was printed in Niranya Sāgara Press, Bombay in Vaiśākha, 1935 (V. E.). Thus it took 13 months approximately in the printing process.

(c) **Vedic Yantrālaya Editions** : The press of the Vedic Yantrālaya came into existence much later. Subsequent nine editions were printed at the Vedic Yantrālaya, Ajmer in single volumes containing Sanskrit and Hindi versions. This press also brought out another edition which contained Sanskrit version only. During the intervening period of the 5th and the 6th editions a Śatābdī edition was also brought out. Thus the Vedic Yantrālaya published eleven editions in all upto A.D. 1967.

II. Edition of Govind Ram Hasa Nand

This was edited by Shri Sukha Deva Vidyāvācaspati of Gurukul Kangri and has improved upon the text.

III. Edition of the Ārya Sāhitya Maṇḍal, Ajmer

It is only a faithful reprint of the Vedic Yantrālaya edition and need not be examined separately here.

IV. Edition of Shri Ram Lal Kapur Trust

It was published in A.D. 1967 or 2024 (V.E.). This is the best of all the editions so far available.

Brief Comments

The Vedic Yantrālaya Editions : The first edition brought out in 16 numbers contained some grammatical or linguistic errors which were corrected by the author himself in the corrigendum appended to it. The second edition (Vedic Yantrālaya) had the corrected version in accordance with the corrigendum of the first edition. In this edition we find improved and modified Sanskrit text to some extent at some places. All subsequent editions upto the fifth edition continued to be based on the second edition. Unfortunately the Śatābdī Saṁskaraṇa was again based on the erroneous text of the first edition and the corrigendum added to it remained neglected. Thus all the mistakes and errors of the first edition again crept into the body of the book. The sixth and the seventh edition are identical with the Śatābdī edition. The eighth edition is the result of the editorial skill of the editor, Shri Mahendra Shastri. He created separate paragraphs for different topics and added references of some of the cited authorities. The ninth edition, edited by Shri Dharam Chand Kothari, contains revised and corrected text and is free from mistakes shown in the said corrigendum of the first edition. He also added new references and put them in the brackets. His footnotes are useful, though some of them are non-essential and a few indicate his grammatical immaturity. For instance, in his footnote on न पराजयातै in the chapter on "Rāja Dharma" he suggested a correction as न पराजयाता in place of न पराजयातै. But according to Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka it is wrong, as पराजयातै is a grammatically correct form in *leṭ* (लेट्) tense which is used only in the Vedas.

Govind Ram Hasa Nand Edition : It is edited by Paṇḍita Sukhdeva Vidyāvācaspati of Gurukul Kangri. It is a commendable attempt at introducing new improvements, e.g. creation of separate paragraphs, separation of questions and answers, notes on difficult passages and improvement in Hindi version. In spite of all this, errors in Sanskrit text continued to exist as before.

Ram Lal Kapur Trust Edition : The Secretary, Ram Lal Kapur Trust, Amritsar published a scholarly edition of this great work in A.D. 1967 which was edited by a known Vedic scholar, Shri Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka. He took sufficient pains to make this publication faultless and authentic. He kept in view all the earlier editions and also collated original manuscripts and incorporated the missing or lost pieces of the text. His footnotes are praiseworthy and indicate his deep observation and mature thinking. This edition has many useful appendices indicating the editor's deep knowledge and mature critical faculty. This is the best of all available editions. But a critical edition is still desired.

8. COMMENTS ON HINDI VERSION

The Hindi translation given in all editions of this work is not correct and faithful to the original Sanskrit text. Ṛṣi Dayānanda wrote this work in Sanskrit only and the work of translation into Hindi was entrusted to Paṇḍitas engaged by him. The Hindi version fails to convey the real spirit and the sense of the original Sanskrit text. Sometimes it runs counter to it. At some other places it is against the accepted concept of the Vedic theology preached by the author. It has a large number of hopeless omissions and commissions. I give below one instance :

Sanskrit Text

एवमेकादश रुद्रा द्वादशादित्या मनः षष्ठानि ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि वायुरन्तरिक्षं द्यौर्मन्त्राश्चेति शरीररहिताः । तथा स्तनयित्नुर्विधियज्ञौ सशरीराशरीरे देवते स्तः ।।

Hindi Version

और ग्यारह रुद्र, बारह आदित्य, मन, अन्तरिक्ष, वायु, द्यौ और मन्त्र ये मूर्त्तिरहित देव हैं तथा पांच ज्ञानेन्द्रियां, बिजुली और विधियज्ञ ये सब मूर्त्तिमान् अमूर्त्तिमान् दोनों हैं ।।

In the original Sanskrit text, five organs of sense are called as non-corporal Devas, while in Hindi they are said to be corporal as well as non-corporal. The futile clarification made in the footnote on the above Hindi version is not acceptable as it is against the original Sanskrit text.

9. TRUE COPY OF THE TITLE PAGE OF THE ṚGVEDĀDI-BHĀṢYA-BHŪMIKĀ (FIRST EDITION)

।। ऋग्वेदादि भाष्य भूमिका ।।

श्रीमद्दयानन्दसरस्वती स्वामिना निर्मिता ।।

।। संस्कृतार्यभाषाभ्यां समन्विता ।।

अस्यैकैकांकस्य प्रतिमासं मूल्यं भारतवर्षान्तर्गतदेशान्तरप्रापण-

मूल्येन सहितं ।≈) एतद् द्वादशमासानां मिलित्वा

वार्षिकं ४।।) भवति ।।

इस ग्रन्थ के प्रतिमास एक एक नम्बर का मूल्य भारतखण्ड के भीतर

डाकमूल्य सहित ।≈) और वार्षिक मूल्य ४।।)

अस्य ग्रन्थस्य ग्रहणेच्छा यस्य भवेत् स काश्यां लाजरसकंपन्याख्यस्य
वा दयानन्दसरस्वती स्वामिनः समीपमस्य वार्षिकं मूल्यं प्रेषयेत् ।

स प्रतिमासमेकं प्राप्स्यति ।।

अङ्क (१)

अयं ग्रन्थः काश्यां लाजरसकंपन्याख्यस्य यन्त्रालये मुद्रितः ।।

संवत् १९३४

अस्य ग्रन्थस्याधिकारो भाष्यकर्त्रा मया सर्वथा स्वाधीन एव रक्षितः ।

विदित हो कि संवत् १९३४ वैशाख महीने में देश पञ्जाब लुधियाना व अमृतसर में

स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती जी निवास करेंगे ।

CHAPTER II

DAYANANDA'S FAITH IN THE VEDAS

REVIVAL OF THE VEDIC RELIGION

Dayānanda's chief aim was the revival of the Vedic religion and the reform of the abuse that had crept into Hindu society, and not the establishment of a new creed which would mean the uprooting of the venerable faith that had grown with growth of the Hindu nation. In the words of Professor Max Müller :

> "He considered the Vedas not only as divinely inspired, but as pre-historic or pre-human."[1]

To him every thing contained in the Vedas was perfect truth. In this matter he was in full agreement with the ancient theologians of India all of whom, without any exception, looked upon the Vedas as divine or super-human. To him a Church that ignored that basic principle of Faith was unthinkable—much more a Church that should be Aryan or Hindu in its origin and conception. His object was to revive the Vedic faith and the Vedic worship. He took his stand on the Vedas. These holy writings were his great weapon against the stronghold of latter-day corrupt Hinduism. Whatever was found in them was to him beyond the reach of controversy, and in this position he had the unanimous support of all that was sacred to the Hindu. Every branch of the sacred literature of the Hindus, from the very earliest times down to the most modern compositions of the different forms of Hindu faith, agreed on that point, and unhesitatingly accepted the authority of the Vedas as final and conclusive. We shall quote later all the relevant authorities to elucidate this point at length. In fact, in the whole range of Indian thought and Indian culture, the only dissenting voice on the point is that of the Buddhists, the Jainas and the Cārvākas (i.e. atheists). Even the Brahmo Samaj had begun with faith in the revealed character and divine origin of the Vedas. Max.Müller, in his *Biographical Essays*, says :

> "Ram Mohan Roy also and his followers held for a time to the revealed character of the Vedas, and in all their early contro-

1. *Biographical Essays.*

versies with Christian Missionaries, they maintained that there was no argument in favour of the divine inspiration of the Bible, which did not apply with the same or even greater force to the Vedas." (p. 168)

Speaking of Ram Mohan Roy, he further says :

> "He never became a Mohammedan, he never became a Christian, but he remained to the end a Brahmana—a believer in the Vedas and in the One God, Who, as he maintained, had been revealed in the Veda." (p. 33)

Thus the Vedas were the sheet-anchor of his propaganda and his scheme of reform. In the words of Max Müller, the idea had taken "such complete possession of his mind that no argument could ever touch it." It was impossible to shake him from that position, and this the leaders of Brahmo Samaj soon found out. So, the attempt to win him over to that Samaj had failed as early as 1869.

Thus we see that the Great Reformer did not attempt to bring about a new faith in the world. He attempted at the revival of the Vedic religion. It was certainly not his desire to impose his own faith on all who would join the Arya Samaj. He wanted them to follow the unanimous opinion of the great Arya sages, divines and scholars, who had made all that was glorious and sublime in the Hindu thought and Hindu culture ; he himself was no more than an humble follower of his illustrious predecessors. Let me elucidate this point by citing below his own words which appear at the end of his great work called the *Satyārtha Prakāśa* :

> "My conception of God and all other objects in the Universe is founded on the teachings of the Vedas and other true Śāstras, and is in conformity with beliefs of all the sages, from Brahmā down to Jaimini. I offer a statement of these beliefs for the acceptance of all good men. That alone I hold to be acceptable which is worthy of being believed in by all men in all ages. *I do not entertain the least idea of founding a new religion or sect.*"

He further adds :

> "The four Vedas, the repository of knowledge and Religious Truth, are the word of God. They comprise what is known as the Saṁhitās—Mantra portion only. They are absolutely free from error, and the supreme and independent authority in all things. They require no other book to bear witness to their divine origin. Even as the sun or a lamp is, by its own light, an absolute and independent manifestor of its existence—yea, it reveals existence of things other than itself—even so are the Vedas."

CHAPTER III

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE VEDAS

THEIR IMPORTANCE

A prominent place in the history of world literature is due to the Vedas not only as the oldest Indian, but also the oldest Indo-European literary monument. This is the case too when we find that throughout 3000 years at least, millions of Hindus have looked upon the words of the Vedas as the word of God and that the Vedas have inspired them with feeling and thought. As the Vedas are the fountain-head of the Indian thought and culture, it is impossible for a man to understand and appreciate the cultural and spiritual life of India, without having deep insight into the Vedic literature.

Even the Buddhistic faith, whose birth place is India, would remain improperly understood for one who is a stranger to the Vedic lore. The teaching of Buddha is in the same relation to the Vedas as the New Testament is to the Old Testament. No one can understand India without knowing the Vedas.

IMPORTANCE FOR THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD

The study of the Ṛgveda is essential not only for complete understanding of the Indian culture and thought as well as the history of India, whether ancient or modern, it is essential also for the elucidation of the history of the world. To quote Professor Max Müller :

> "In the history of the world, the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in the long row of books will belong for ever to the Ṛgveda." (*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 65)

He further remarks :

> "I maintain that to every body who cares for himself, for his ancestors, for his history, for his intellectual development, a study of the Vedic literature is indispensable."

Mons. Leon Delbos says :

> "There is no monument of Greece or Rome more precious than the Ṛgveda."

Regarding the antiquity of the Veda, Sir W.W. Hunter remarks :

> "The age of this hymnal (Ṛgveda) is unknown."

VEDA AND PHILOLOGY

Above all, the study of the Vedas is most important from the point of view of philology or the science of language. The study of language, as distinguished from the mere acquisition of language, is a growth of the last century, though it must be admitted that researches into the genealogies and affinities of words have exercised the ingenuity of numberless generations of acute and inquiring minds. Still nothing deserving the name of science was the result of these older investigations in the domain of languages. Those were merely hasty generalisations, baseless hypotheses, and inconclusive deductions. As in the case with every science in its early stage, the science of language, too, was attended with difficulties, namely, paucity of observed facts, and faulty standpoint. Whitney has rightly said :

> "National self-sufficiency and inherited prepossession long helped to narrow the limits imposed by unfavourable circumstances upon the extent of linguistic knowledge, restraining that liberality of inquiry which is indispensable to the growth of a science." (*Language and Its Study*, p. 2)

Thus in ancient times, every one thought his own dialect to be the oldest one with which to start and compare other dialects. Until very recently Latin and Greek were supposed to be the oldest and the most primitive known languages from which every European language was derived. But the restless and penetrating investigation which characterised the last century changed the whole aspect of the study, and linguists busied themselves with the study of the special relationship of the principal languages of Europe with one another and with the languages of South-Western Asia, which led to the postulation of the Indo-European family of languages.

Whitney further remarks—

> "No single circumstance more powerfully aided the onward movement than the introduction to Western scholars, of Sanskrit, the ancient and sacred dialect of India. Its exceeding age, its

remarkable conservation of primitive material and form, its unequalled transparency of structure give it an indisputable right to the first place among the tongues of the Indo-European family. Upon their comparison, already fully begun, it cast a new and welcome light, displaying clearly their hitherto obscure relations, recctifying their doubtful etymologies, illustrating the laws of research which must be followed in their study and in that of all other languages.'' (*Ibid.*, p. 4)

Let me quote one more authority on the subject. Sayce, in his work *The Science of Language*, says :

"What has been termed the discovery of Sanskrit by Western scholars put an end to all the fanciful playing with words and created the Science of Language." (Vol. I, p. 38)

STUDY OF THE VEDAS IN FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES

From all this we can easily see what an important part the ancient Vedic Sanskrit has played in the domain of the science of language. The study of the Vedic literature has created, in reality, the philology. What I want to say here is that the Vedic Sanskrit is much older than the later Sanskrit which precedes Latin and Greek, and that it represents a state of civilisation, nowhere else represented. It provides us with many links, which are otherwise obscure. It is a matter of national pride for us that the *Ṛgveda* and other allied Vedic literature form a special and important subject of study at most of the important universities of Europe and America ; an unparalleled activity in the domain of Vedic study is manifested every where ; single words are studied critically and their history traced through all available works ; indexes and glossaries are multiplied and exhaustive commentaries produced.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT IS THE VEDA ?

DERIVATION OF THE WORD

The word 'Veda' means "knowledge", then "the knowledge par excellence." Sāyaṇa and others have derived the word Veda from the root *Vid* (विद्) 'to know' with suffix *Ac* or *Ghañ*, i.e., knowledge, sacred knowledge, holy learning. Dayānanda derives it from the following four roots :

(a) *Vid* : to know (*Adādi, Seṭ, Parasmaipada*)—*Vetti.*

(b) *Vid* : to exist or to be (*Divādi, Aniṭ*)—*Vidyate.*

(c) *Vid* : to discriminate (*Rudhādi, Aniṭ*)—*Vinte.*

(d) *Vidḷ* : to obtain or acquire (*Tudādi, Seṭ*)—*Vindati* or *Vindate.*

But to this list another fifth root can be added. The Dhātu-pāṭha reads *Vid* in the sense of *Cetanā, Ākhyāna,* and *Nivāsa,* (*Curādi, Seṭ*)—*Vedayati* or *Vedayate.* It means 'to make known, communicate, inform, apprise, tell or teach'. For instance, we have the following verse :

वेदार्थं स्वानवेदयत् । (*S. K.*)

Thus the Vedas are so called as all men or women know all true sciences in or through them, or as all true sciences exist in them, or as men become learned by studying them.[1]

The following explanation of the word Veda, which is given by orthodox people is also based upon these derivations :

(1) विद्यन्ते ज्ञायन्ते लभ्यन्ते वा एभिः धर्मादिपुरुषार्था इति वेदाः ।

(*Br. Pratiśākhya*)

---

1. Cf. वेत्ति सर्वाणि शास्त्राणि गर्वस्तस्य न विद्यते ।
विन्त धर्मं सदा सद्भिः तेषु पूजां च विन्दति ॥ १ ॥
सत्तायां विद्यते ज्ञाने वेत्ति विन्ते विचारणे ।
विन्दति विन्दते प्राप्तौ श्यन्लुक्श्नम्शेष्विदं क्रमात् ॥ २ ॥

This stanza also describes different *Vikaraṇas,*

(2) इष्टप्राप्त्यनिष्टपरिहारयोरलौकिकमुपायं यो वेदयति स वेदः ।

(3) प्रत्यक्षेणानुमित्या वा यस्तूपायो न बुध्यते ।
एतं विदन्ति वेदेन तस्मात् वेदस्य वेदता ॥

The word Veda or its root *Vid* has commonly been found in almost all languages of the Indo-European family. For instance, Latin has the word *Vidco*; A. S. *Witan*; Goth. *Vait*; and English *Wit*. The undermentioned English words have also their origin in the root *Vid*:

> "wit, wise, wisdom, witch, wizard, provide, vision, idea, visage, visor, revise, supervise, evidence, invidious, review, survey, view, device, visit, etc."

THE VEDA—THE WORD OF GOD

The Vedas are four in number : the *Rgveda*, the *Yajurveda*, the *Sāmaveda* and the *Atharvaveda*. The Āryas consider them to be the word of God. All Hindus are unanimous in regarding the Vedas as God-revealed. According to them God revealed His knowledge to mankind in the beginning of creation, in order to guide man in all matters, religious as well as secular, during his sojourn on earth. This position is quite understandable. God could not have, it is argued, waited for giving His dispensation to mankind several thousands of years after the appearance of man on this earth. Thus the claims made by the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims, that the Bible and the Quran were the words of God, cannot be sustained. Leaving aside other reasons, one main ground for the rejection of this claim is that the earlier societies could not have been deprived of the benefit of Divine Guidance at the beginning of the creation of mankind. Hence the revelation of the Vedas (Divine Knowledge) in the very beginning is quite reasonable. The reasonableness and the desirability of Divine Guidance have successfully and logically been established by Dayānanda in all his works. The interested reader is advised to read them with profit.

The authors of almost all the ancient Sanskrit works, available in more than 1000 texts even now, pay the highest homage to the Vedas. These religious and secular works in their turn have won the admiration of many Sanskrit scholars of the West. The authors of these works maintain the divine origin of the four Vedas.

Two kinds of evidence, internal and external, can be adduced to prove or disprove the proposition whether the Vedas are revealed.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Internal evidence, again, can be of two kinds : one referring to the claims preferred by the books themselves, the validity or the futility of their claims to be judged by the consistency or the inconsistency of what is urged; and the other, the quality of the stuff preserved. As regards the first, we have seen already that the Vedas do lay claims to the position of a revealed work and profess to have directly proceeded from divine source.

There are, according to the European scholars, traces in the Vedas of a belief, and data for the propounding of the theory, that all the Vedas did not come into existence at one and the same time, but even if there were such traces, they could not shake the position of the Vedas as revealed books. There are, so far as we can say, no contradictory statements in the Vedas, which must discredit even a secular book in the eyes of the critics. The following citations from the Vedas themselves clearly establish that the Vedas do profess the claim—

1. तस्माद् यज्ञात् सर्वहुत: ऋच: सामानि जज्ञिरे ।
   छन्दांᳬसि जज्ञिरे तस्माद् यजुस्तस्मादजायत ॥

[From that adorable God, the *Ṛg-*, the *Sama-*, the *Chandas-* (i.e. the *Atharva*) and the *Yajurveda* were produced.]

(*RV*. X.90.13), (*YV*. XXXI.7)

2. यस्मादृचो अपातक्षन् यजुर्यस्मादपाकषन् ।
   सामानि यस्य लोमान्यथर्वाङ्गिरसो मुखम् ।
   स्कम्भं तं ब्रूहि कतमः स्विदेव सः ॥

[Who is that Great Being who revealed the *Ṛgveda*, the *Yajurveda*, the *Samaveda* and the *Atharvaveda* ? He is the Supreme Spirit who has created the universe and sustains it.] (*AV* X.7.20)

Similarly we get the following verse which clearly supports this proposition—

3. कालादृच: समभवन् यजु: कालादजायत ।
   कालेऽयमङ्गिरो देवोऽथर्वा चाधि तिष्ठतः ॥ (*AV*. XIX.54.5)

Citations can be multiplied from the Vedas themselves.

As regards the quality of the teachings of the Vedas, we can simply say that the Vedas, inculcating the worship of one Holy, Just and Merciful

God, laying down a strict code of morality, and being scrupulously free from absurd theories and outrageous speculations, are the revelation of God, His word, His cherished message to His children below.

If revelation, in the sense in which it is taken by all believers in revelation, were a possibility, the Vedas will undoubtedly stand supreme and undisputably claim that high position. For God is just and perfect, and revelation is the one, the chief form in which He shows His mercy and love for mankind, it must have been given in the beginning and God should not have had any reason to alter His former decree or stand in need of a second, third and fourth revelation to perfect His first message, i.e. revelation. A faith in revelation compels one, by a logical necessity, to accept the Vedas as the real revelation, for the Vedas are the oldest books claiming to be the word of God. It must be a strange sort of love and mercy which should have kept mankind, in their infancy, without a guide, philosopher, and friend, when they required it most, and should have kept them waiting for thousands of years till some instructions were sent down to guide them in this strange land where they had fallen down from paradise.

Seers are not Authors :

The idea suggested by some critics that the Seers whose names appear in the Vedas, alongwith the metres &c., were the authors of the Vedas, will be critically examined later on at the proper place. It would suffice here to state that they were 'seers', not 'composers' of the stanzas. They simply saw or realised the sense of the Mantras. The following stanza clearly states this—

4. यज्ञेन वाचः पदवीयमायन्
तामन्वविन्दन् ऋषिषु प्रविष्टाम् ।
तामाभृत्या व्यदधुः पुरुत्रा
तां सप्तरेभा अभि सं नवन्ते ॥

[The wise discovered it (i.e. speech) placed in the (hearts of) the Seers.] (*RV.* X.71.3)

Here the last clause *Tām Sapta Rebhā Abhi-Saṁnavante* deserves particular notice and it has been explained by H.H. Wilson as : "The previous words refer to the diffusion of learning ; those who have studied the Vedas have afterwards taught it to the others."

Again the phrase *Ṛṣiṣu Praviṣṭām* in this verse clearly establishes the fact that the 'speech', i.e. the Divine Speech, entered the hearts of the Seers (in the beginning of creation). This means the Seers (who are not composers) are the Divinely inspired people. For this reason they were called 'seers' and not the authors.

Yāska explains the word *Ṛṣi* as *Ṛṣiḥ Darśanāt*.

There are many more verses in the Vedas which, in no uncertain terms, declare the Vedas to have proceeded from God.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

The external evidence that the followers of the Vedas adduce in favour of their view is not of an historical nature, such as has been given by the defenders of the Bible, in their attempt to prove the Bible to be the word of God. Nor is it based upon the historical evidence of the other kind, such as given in favour of the Quran, for which a divine source is claimed on the ground that its apparent and ostensible author was quite unlettered and did not know B from a battle door, and consequently, the Quran, full of lofty teachings and couched in sublime language, could not but have proceeded from a divine source. No such evidence is possible for the Vedas and we think it better for the Vedas that they do not depend upon such evidence for the maintenance of their authority.

The external evidence which can be given in favour of the exalted position of the Vedas is of persons whose sincerity and scholarship the world has admitted, and whose flight of imagination the enlightened races of the world are struggling to follow. Considered from strictly logical point of view, the evidence of these men may not be conclusive and may not convince the logical sceptic. But the whole body of ancient writers of the sacred and secular literature of the Hindus, declaring with one voice the superhuman origin of the Vedas and bowing like one man before their authority, is a fact which possesses special significance for a Hindu.

It will require a whole volume to quote, in full, the evidence, the Seers of yore bore in favour of the Vedas. The following few representative citations from the massive Sanskrit literature will clearly bear powerful testimony to the undisputed authority of the Vedas and pay due homage to their divine sanctity—

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* says :

1. एवं वा अरेऽस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतद् यद् ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्वाङ्गिरसः ।

[O Maitreyī ! the *Ṛgveda*, the *Yajurveda*, the *Sāmaveda* and the *Atharvaveda* are (like) the breath of that Supreme Being.]
(*SB.* XIV.5.4.10)

2. अग्नेः ऋग्वेदो वायोर्यजुर्वेदः सूर्यात् सामवेदः ।

[The ṚV. from Agni, the YV. from Vāyu and the SV. from Sūrya were produced.] (*SB.* XI.5.8.3)

Similarly the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* says :

ऋग्वेद एवाग्नेरजायत यजुर्वेदो वायोः सामवेद आदित्यात् । (*AB.* XXV.7)

The author of the *Nirukta* says :

1. पुरुषविद्यानित्यत्वात् कर्मसम्पत्तिर्मन्त्रो वेदे ।

[The human knowledge is non-eternal. Hence the Mantras containing accomplishment of the actions are found in the Vedas.] (*N.* I.2)

2. नियतवाचोयुक्तयो नियतानुपूर्व्या भवन्ति । (*N.* I.16)

Pāṇini and Patañjali, the two great grammarians of India, also hold the view that the Vedas are not of human origin, while the Śākhās, e.g. *Kāṭhaka,* &c., have human authorship. The difference between the man-made and the God-revealed works is expressed by the following two aphorisms :

1. कृते ग्रन्थे । (*P.* IV.3.113)

2. तेन प्रोक्तम् । (*P.* IV.3.101)

Patañjali in his commentary of the above-quoted second aphorism says :

या त्वसौ वर्णानुपूर्वी साऽनित्या । तद् भेदाच्चैतत् भवति काठकं कालापकं मोदं पैप्पलादकमिति । (*P.* IV.3.101)

[The particular arrangement of words in (the man-made works e.g.) *Kāṭhaka*, &c , is non-eternal while the same is eternal in the Vedas which are the words of God.] (*P.* IV.3.101)

Again he says :

स्वरो नियत आम्नायेऽस्य वामशब्दस्य । वर्णानुपूर्वी खल्वाम्नाये नियतास्य वामशब्दस्य ।

[The *Svaras* (accents) and the particular arrangement of words in the Vedas are eternal, i.e. they are God-revealed.] (*MB.* V.2.53)

The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* says :

1. प्रजापतिः सोमराजानमसृजत । तं त्रयो वेदा अन्वसृज्यन्त ।

[Prajāpati created king Soma and afterwards the triple Vedas were created.] (*TB.* III.10)

2. नावेदविन्मनुते तं बृहन्तम् ।

[He who does not know the Vedas, does not know Him who is Great.] (*TB.* XII.9)

The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* asserts what has been said by the *Śatapatha* :

1. तासां तप्यमानानां रसान् प्रावृहत् । अग्नेः ऋचो वायोः यजूंषि सामान्यादित्यात् ।

[From them, so heated (i.e. inspired), He drew forth their essence, from Agni, Ṛcas ; from Vāyu, Yajus, and from Āditya, Sāma.]

2. The same sense has been conveyed by the *Śatapatha* :

तेभ्यस्तप्तेभ्यः त्रयो वेदा अजायन्त ।

[From these three (Seers) being heated (i.e. inspired by God) the three Vedas were produced.]

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* states :

1. स तया वाचा तेनात्मना इदं सर्वमसृजत । यदिदं किञ्च ऋचो यजूंषि सामानि छन्दांसि ॥

[By that speech and that soul, He created all this, the *Ṛg.*, the *Yajur*, the *Sāmans* and the *Chandas* (*Atharvans*).]

2. अस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतत् यद् ऋग्वेदः…… ।

[These RV. (etc.) are the breathings of the Mighty Lord.]

The Smṛtis (i.e. Law Books) also echo the same sentiment :

1. अग्निवायुरविभ्यस्तु त्रयं ब्रह्म सनातनम् ।
दुदोह यज्ञसिद्ध्यर्थं ऋग्यजुःसामलक्षणम् ॥

[The triple Veda, RV., YV. and SV., is eternal and the Lord revealed it through Agni, Vāyu and Ravi (i.e. the Seers).]

(*MS.* I.23)

Manu again says :

1. पितृदेवमनुष्याणां वेद: चक्षु: सनातनम् ।
अशक्यं चाप्रमेयं च वेदशास्त्रमिति स्थिति: ॥

[The Veda is the eternal eye of the mankind and it is *Aśakya* (beyond human creation) and *Aprameya* (i.e. not easy to be understood).] (*Manu* XII.95)

3. वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलं स्मृतिशीले च तद्विदाम् ।
आचारश्चैव भूतानामात्मनस्तुष्टिरेव च ॥

य: कश्चित् कस्यचिद् धर्म: मनुना परिकीर्त्तित: ।
स: सर्वोऽभिहितो वेदे सर्वज्ञानमयो हि स: ॥

सर्वं तु समवेक्ष्यैतत् निखिलं ज्ञानचक्षुषा ।
श्रुतिप्रामाण्यतो विद्वान् स्वधर्मे निवशेत वै ॥

[Dharma rests on the whole Veda ; .... Manu states that all Dharma which has been propounded by him is contained in the Veda, the whole of which is true knowledge. A man should determine his Dharma by the authority of the Veda.]

4. चातुर्वर्ण्यं त्रयो लोका: चत्वारश्चाश्रमा: पृथक् ।
भूतं भव्यं भविष्यं च सर्वं वेदात् प्रसिद्धयति ॥ (XII.97)

5. सेनापत्यं च राज्यं च दण्डनेतृत्वमेव च ।
सर्वलोकाधिपत्यं च वेदशास्त्रविदर्हति ॥ (XII.150)

The poet philosopher Vyāsa repeats this idea in the Śāntiparva of his *Mahābhārata* :

अनादिनिधना नित्या वागुत्सृष्टा स्वयम्भुवा ।
आदौ वेदमयी दिव्या यत: सर्वा: प्रवृत्तय: ॥

[The Self-born God revealed the Divine Speech in the form of the Veda which has no beginning and end and is hence eternal.] (232.34)

The authors of the Darśanas, rigorous logicians as they were, humbly acknowledged the infallibility of the Vedas.

Kaṇāda, the author of the Vaiśeṣika system of Philosophy, says :

तद्वचनात् आम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम् ।

[The Vedas being His words are authoritative.]

In this aphorism the word *Tat* (i.e. that) refers to God. It is clearly stated by all commentators. For instance, Śaṅkara Miśra writes on this word :

तद्वचनात्-तेनेश्वरेण प्रणयनात् ; आम्नायस्य-वेदस्य, प्रामाण्यम् ॥ (I. 1.3)

Udayana also corroborates it in his *Kiraṇāvalī Prakāśa* :

तेनेश्वरेण वचनात् प्रणयनात् आम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम् ॥

In the same way Gautama, the author of the Nyāya System of Philosophy, recognises the Vedas to be authoritative in the following aphorisms :

1. मन्त्रायुर्वेदप्रामाण्यवच्च तत्प्रामाण्यमाप्तप्रामाण्यात् ।
2. अतिप्रामाण्याच्च ।

Vātsyāyana, the commentator of the above book, explains this aphorism :

य एवाप्ता वेदार्थानां द्रष्टारः प्रवक्तारश्च त एवायुर्वेदप्रभृतीनाम् ॥

(*NB.* II.1.67)

Kapila, the author of Sāṅkhya system of Philosophy, admits the Vedas to be the word of God :

1. अपौरुषेयत्वं तत्कर्तुः पुरुषस्याभावात् ।

[The Vedas are not human creation. No man is their author.]

(V. 46)

2. निजशक्त्यभिव्यक्तेः स्वतः प्रामाण्यम् ।

[The Vedas are authoritative by themselves as they have been revealed by His own power.] (V. 51)

The same notion has been repeated in the Mīmāṁsā Bhāṣya by Kumārila :

कर्तुः स्मरणाभावात् अपौरुषेया वेदा इति । (*Tantra Vartika*)

The Mīmāṁsā confirms this view :

वेदस्य च धर्मे प्रामाण्यम् ।

[The Veda is authority in the matter of Dharma.]

Patañjali's view in the *Yoga Darśana* is :

स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात् ।

[Verily he is the teacher of the ancients as He is not bound by time.]

Vācaspati Miśra corroborates this view :

तथा चाभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसोपदेशपरोऽपि वेदराशिः ईश्वरप्रणीतः ।

Vyāsa, the author of the Vedānta, openly declares :

शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ।

[The Supreme Being is the origin of the Vedas.] (I. 1.3)

The great Śaṅkara comments upon it :

न हीदृशस्य शास्त्रस्य ऋग्वेदादिलक्षणस्य सर्वज्ञगुणान्वितस्य सर्वज्ञादन्यतः सम्भवोऽस्ति । (*VB.* I.1.3)

अतएव नित्यत्वम् ।

[Hence the Veda is eternal.] (*VD.* I.3.29)

The following aphorisms from the Mīmāṁsā fully discuss this topic and decide finally that the Vedas are superhuman :

नित्यस्तु स्याद् दर्शनस्य परार्थत्वात् । (I. 1.18)

वेदांश्चैके सन्निकर्षं पुरुषाख्या । (I. 1.27)

उक्तन्तु शब्दपूर्वत्वम् । (I. 1.29)

आख्या प्रवचनात् । (I. 1.30)

Kumārila sums up his comments upon the last noted aphorism as :

सर्वो हि यथैव गुरुणाधीतं तथैवाधिजिगांसते । न पुनः स्वातन्त्र्येण कश्चिदपि प्रथमोऽध्येता वेदानामस्ति, यः कर्त्ता स्यात् । तस्मात् कर्तृस्मरणाभावात् अपौरुषेया वेदा इति भावः । एवं च पूर्वमेव वेदापौरुषेयत्वस्य सिद्धत्वात् तद्विषये पुनः प्रयत्नो न करणीयः ।

In the Bhāṣya of *Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra* we find :

कथं वेदस्य प्रामाण्यम् ? अपौरुषेयत्वात् ।

The Purāṇas are generally discarded as full of absurdities but to us they do not seem to form an exception to the rule : there is the soul of good in every thing. They are at this day the source of inspiration to thousands of Hindus who have never read or heard a line from the Vedas. The evidence of the Purāṇas, therefore, is not without its value in admitting and proclaiming the divine origin of the Vedas, more so, because the Purāṇas are believed to be responsible for having displaced the Vedas.

The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* says :

गायत्रं च ऋचश्चैव बृहत्साम रथन्तरम् ।
अग्निष्टोमश्च यज्ञानां निर्ममे प्रथमात् मुखात् ।

[From His Eastern mouth Brahmā[1] formed the *Gāyatra*, the *Ṛcas*, *Trivṛtsāma*, *Rathantara* &c., and *Yajur* &c., from His Southern mouth and so on.]

---

1. Brahmā here means God to whom all the four directions are known and visible. Hence He is called four-faced or multi-faced (*RV*. X.81.3). The Creator as pervader of the Universe is known as *Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Parameṣṭhin* or *Brahmā* as He encompasses the whole material world. His four faces metaphorically represent His Omnipresence and Omniscience.

It is also popularly understood that Brahmā sprang up from the navel of Viṣṇu and Viṣṇu is regarded to be reclining under waters with his consort Lakṣmī. The Purāṇas took this metaphor and personification

(Contd.)

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* observes :

कदाचिद् ध्यायतः स्रष्टुः वेदाः आसंस् चतुर्मुखात् ।

[Once, the Vedas sprang from the four-faced Creator, as he meditated.]

Similarly, Skanda Svāmī, Durga, Bhartṛhari, Udayana, Vācaspati, Vijñana Bhikṣu and all other scholars share this view.

Our aim to present and quote all the representative authors of Sanskrit literature is to show to the reader that the Veda commanded the highest position in the world literature because of its being the word of God.

THE GREATNESS OF THE VEDA

If what has been said above is not strong and sufficient enough to satisfy a non-believer, regarding the essentiality and possibility of revelation and also the revealed character of the Vedas, it must have at least made it amply evident that the Vedas occupy the highest position in the sacred literature of the Hindus and have for thousands of years past been their infallible guide in all the matters, religious as well as secular. We finish this topic by again citing a few lines from the law books :

1. वेदो वृक्षः तस्य मूलं प्रणवः । (बोधायन धर्मसूत्र)
2. वेद एव द्विजातीनां निःश्रेयसकरः परः । (याज्ञवल्क्य)
3. सेनापत्यं च राज्यं च दण्डनेतृत्वमेव च ।
   सर्वलोकाधिपत्यं च वेदशास्त्रविदर्हति ।। (मनु०)
4. नास्ति वेदात् परं शास्त्रं नास्ति मातुः समो गुरुः । (अत्रि)

(Contd. from page xxvii)

too far in the domain of religion, but a peep into the Vedas will clearly show that it is nothing but a partial statement of the theory of creation mentioned in the Vedas. "Viṣṇu resting under the water with Lakṣmī" simply means the All-pervading Lord with His all-powerful dignity, controlling the entire matter in fluid condition. "Brahmā sprang forth from the navel" only indicates that Viṣṇu came to be called *Hiraṇyagarbha*.

It will now appear that the theory of Brahmā's authorship of the Vedas does not clash with the views of other sages, including Dayānanda, as it simply implies the divine authorship of the Veda.

EUROPEAN SCHOLARS' VIEW

It would be unwise for us to finish the topic without mentioning here the school of thought of the non-orthodox scholars.

Here, however, in the beginning it must be stated that when we call the four Vedas four books, we must not understand the statement literally. If a book means a work written by one man, implying unity of time and ideas, well, the Vedas are far from being books. They are rather compilations, composed of several books which can be individually distinguished from each other. The form in which the Saṁhitā of the *Ṛgveda* has come down to us clearly shows that the different hymns were composed long before they were brought together and systematically arranged. That the different portions of the Saṁhitā represent chronologically different stages, follows from various indications of language, vocabulary, style, grammar, metre and lastly ideas. As in the Hebrew book of Psalms, so also here, songs which had been composed at widely separated periods of times were united at some time in a collection, and ascribed to (some) famous personages of prehistoric times, preferably to the earliest ancestors of those families in which the songs in question were handed down. The names of the singers or Seers (i.e. prophets) who, as the Indians say, 'visioned these hymns' are mentioned, partly in the Brāhmaṇas, partly in separate lists of authors (i.e. *Anukramaṇīs*) connected with the Vedāṅga literature.

Thus we see that the above discussed view of the orthodox people, which has a long and continuous stream of tradition behind it, is not shared by the European scholarship. The tradition has its own beauty and charm while the modern thought weighs every thing in its own way.

CHAPTER V

THE DIVISION OF THE VEDAS

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Dayānanda, like all other ancient scholars, says that the Vedas are four in number : the *Ṛgveda*, the *Yajurveda*, the *Sāmaveda* and the *Atharvaveda*. According to him this four-fold division is eternal and not man-made. *Jñāna*, *Karma*, *Upāsanā*, and *Vijñāna* are the distinct subjects of these four Vedas respectively. The following are the etymological explanations of the titles of the Vedas :

1. ऋचन्ति-स्तुवन्ति, पदार्थानां गुणकर्मस्वभावान् अनया सा ऋक् ।
2. यजन्ति येन (मनुष्या ईश्वरं धार्मिकान् विदुषश्च) पूजयन्ति, शिल्पविज्ञानसंगतिकरणं च कुर्वन्ति तत् यजु: ।
3. स्यति कर्माणि इति साम ।
4. थर्वति: चरतिकर्मा तत्प्रतिषेधः । (*N.* XI.18) and also चर्संशये (चुरादि) संशयराहित्यं सम्पाद्यते येन सोऽथर्ववेद: ।

We have given these explanations to include the four main types of subject-matter given by Dayānanda pertaining to each Veda :

> *Vijñāna* (i.e. realisation of knowledge), *Karma* (i.e. action), *Upāsanā* (i.e. communion with God) and *Jñāna* (i.e. absolute knowledge).

That is to say, the *Ṛgveda* deals with *Vijñāna*, the *Yajurveda* with religious activities, the *Sāmaveda* with worship and the *Atharvaveda* with all types of specific sciences.

Many scholars like Durga, Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara and Mahīdhara are of the opinion that originally there was one Veda—undivided—which was produced by Brahmā in the beginning. Later on in the Dvāpara (Silver) age the same one Veda was split into four parts by the great sage Vyāsa. It is strange to note that for this they have not adduced any authority.

This assertion is wholly wrong as we have already cited some verses from the Vedas themselves which enumerated separately four Vedas :

1. तस्मात् यज्ञात् सर्वहुत: ऋच: सामानि जज्ञिरे ।
छन्दाँसि जज्ञिरे तस्मात् यजुस्तस्मादजायत ।। (*RV*. X.90.9)
(*YV*. XXXI.7)

2. यस्मादृचो अपातक्षन् यजुर्यस्मादपाकषन् ।
सामानि यस्य लोमान्यथर्वाङ्गिरसो मुखम् ।। (*AV*. X.7.20)

Similarly in *Atharvaveda* (IV.35.6 and XIX.9.12) we come across the word *Vedāḥ* in plural number which clearly implies that the Vedas were four in number even in the beginning. The above-cited verses clearly mention the four names of the Vedas separately.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

Again the following quotations expressly mention the Vedas separately :

1. एष वा अरे अस्य महतो भूतस्य नि:श्वसितमेतद् यद् ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेद: सामवेदोथर्वाङ्गिरस: ।। (*SB*. XIV.5.4.10)
2. Also in *Gopatha* (I. 3.1) the names of the four Vedas occur alongwith the phrase *Sarvān ca Vedān* (i.e. all the Vedas).
3. यदेनमृग्भि: शंसन्ति यजुर्भि: यजन्ति सामभि: स्तुवन्ति । (*N*. XIII.7)
4. ऋग्भि: शंसन्ति यजुर्भि: यजन्ति सामभि: स्तुवन्ति अथर्वभि: जपन्ति । (*Kāṭhaka Saṁ*. XXX.7)
5. तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेद: सामवेदोऽथर्ववेद: शिक्षा कल्पो व्याकरणं निरुक्तं छन्दो ज्योतिषम् । (*MU*. I.I.5)
6. The above-cited verses from Manu I.23, and others.
7. चत्वारो वेदा: साङ्गा: सरहस्या ········ एकशतमध्वर्युशाखा: सहस्रवर्त्मा सामवेद: एकविंशतिधा बाह्वृच्यं नवधाथर्वणो वेद: । (*Mahābhāṣya*)
8. नानृग्वेदविनीतस्य नायजुर्वेदधारिण: ।
नासामवेदविदुष: शक्यमेवं प्रभाषितुम् ।। (*Rāmāyaṇa* IV.3.28)

When we find that all these works, which are sufficiently earlier than Vyāsa, declare openly the existence of four Vedas separately and also when the Vedas themselves proclaim that the Vedas are four in number, the

contention of Durga and Mahīdhara that the original one Veda was divided into four by Vyāsa cannot be accepted. It is also evident from this statement of Durga and Mahīdhara that they were quite ignorant of a popular conception about the Veda. This ignorance is the cause of their wrong intrepretation of the Vedas.

There are a few European scholars who maintain that the number of the Vedas is limited to three only. The original cause of this illusion, however, lies with the Hindus themselves, though they are not to blame, if others will not or cannot rightly understand them.

The mistake has evidently been caused by a misunderstanding of Manu and other seers of yore :

1. अग्निवायुरविभ्यस्तु त्रयं ब्रह्म सनातनम् ।
दुदोह यज्ञसिद्ध्यर्थं ऋग्यजुःसामलक्षणम् ॥

[From Agni, Vāyu and Ravi (Sun) He drew forth for the accomplishment of sacrifice, the eternal triple Veda distinguished as *Ṛk*, *Yajuś*, and *Sāman*. (Muir)] (*M*. I.23)

2. त्रयी वा विद्या ऋचो यजूंषि सामानि । (*SB*. IV.6.7.1)

3. स एतां त्रयीं विद्यामभ्यतपत् । (*CHU*)

We have, by numerous citations, already proved beyond doubt that the Vedas were four in the beginning also. But the European scholars could not rightly understand the word *Trayī* (triple) in these quotations. Manu, as well as other authorities, do not mean to limit the number of the Vedas to three, but simply speak of the three-fold science embodied in them. For instance, the *SB* (IV.6.7.1) cited above in part (1) and also the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* in part (3) above clearly mention that the names *Ṛk*, *Yajur* and *Sāma* here mean three sciences and not the names of the Vedas. The Mīmāṁsā again confirms this interpretation in the following :

तेषामृग् यत्रार्थवशेन पाद-व्यवस्था । (II.1.65)

गीतिषु सामाख्या । (II.1.66)

शेषे यजुः शब्दः । (II.1.67)

Thus this triple division is based on the three sciences dealt with in the four Vedas. Not to speak of all the Hindu scholars supporting this view, it is strongly confirmed by Prof. H. Kern, who says :

"When the Hindus speak of the three Vedas, they mean that there is a triple Veda consisting (1) of recited verses (Rich),

(2) of verses, sung (Sāman), and (3) of formulas in prose (Yajuṣ) ; all these words being comprehended under the name of 'Mantras'. Altogether independent of the three sorts of Mantras is the number of collections of them. *Though there were a hundred collections of Mantras, the Veda is, and remains, threefold*...............It does not need to be proved that we must know that principle on which any distribution proceeds before we can deduce any conclusion from numbers."

Thus it is consequently nothing but short-sightedness to limit the number of the Vedic collections to three. The *Atharvaveda* is as much a Veda as any of the other three. Its subject-matter is identical with and considerably similar to the *Ṛgveda*. We have cited the above internal and external evidence to show that the *Atharvaveda* equally and rightly claims the same position as the other three Vedas.

CHAPTER VI

DEFINITION OF THE VEDAS

SĀYAṆA'S FAULTY VIEW

The great commentator of the Vedas—Sāyaṇa—who lived and wrote at a time when the sun of the Vedic traditions had long set, defines the Veda as मन्त्रब्राह्मणात्मकः शब्दराशिर्वेदः, and then he adds that निर्दोषं लक्षणम्, i.e., the definition of the Veda as the sum of Mantras and Brāhmaṇas is a faultless one. Then he refers to the *Yajña Paribhāṣā* of Āpastamba, where the "name of the Veda is given to the Mantras and Brāhmaṇas." But this definition of the Veda given by Sāyaṇa is ridiculous as he could not discriminate between the Mantra portion and the Brāhmaṇa portion. This fact he himself has admitted.

Sāyaṇa's definition is based on the following statement of Kātyāyana :

मन्त्रब्राह्मणयोः वेदनामधेयम् ।

DAYĀNANDA'S VIEW

But Dayānanda was the first among the modern scholars to explode this view and to demonstrate that the Saṁhitās only formed the Vedas and they alone were to be regarded as eternal, and infallible, as Vedas in fact. The Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads themselves profess to be mere parasites of the Vedas and devote themselves respectively to the elucidation of the ritualistic and the philosophical portions of the Vedas. No Saṁhitā, on the other hand, professes to hang upon any other Saṁhitā as its parasite and devote itself to explain any portion of the others. Hence, Dayānanda says :

> न ब्राह्मणानां वेदसंज्ञा भवितुमर्हति । कुतः ? पुराणेतिहाससंज्ञकत्वात् वेदव्याख्यानात् ऋषिभिरुक्तत्वात् अनीश्वरोक्तत्वात् कात्यायनभिन्नैः ऋषिभिः वेदसंज्ञाया अस्वीकृतत्वात् मनुष्यबुद्धिरचितत्वाच्चेति ।

[The Brāhmaṇas do not deserve to be called by the name of the Veda because they have been given the names of the Purāṇa and Itihāsa ; they are elucidations of the Vedas and are not the words of God but merely the works of the seers and the products of human intellect ; also because all sages other than Kātyāyana have refused to call them by the name of Veda.]

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SAṀHITĀS AND BRĀHMAṆAS

This is quite true that there are no stories in the Vedas. The Brāhmaṇas do contain narratives of human beings, while the Vedas are free from stories and tales :

1. देवासुराः संयत्ता आसन् ।
2. सदेव सौम्य इदमग्र आसीत् । *(CHU)*

It must be pointed out here that some scholars have tried to deduce some historical detail from the Saṁhitās but no story, beginning with "There was etc." and "There lived once, etc.", such as are of common occurrence in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, has been found in the Vedas (Saṁhitās) even by the Europeans, who always smell out history in every nook and corner of a literature.

Tradition plays a great part in clearing up matters such as we are now discussing and all the evidence derived from this source is in favour of the view that the Saṁhitās only form the Vedas proper. Patañjali, the great grammarian, always quotes from the Saṁhitās to illustrate the special rules applicable to Vedic Sanskrit without quoting a single line or phrase from the Upaniṣads or Brāhmaṇas ; his non-Vedic illustrations include passages from both the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads :

केषां शब्दानाम् । लौकिकानां वैदिकानाम् च । तत्र लौकिकास्तावत् गौरश्वः पुरुषो हस्ती शकुनिर्मृगो ब्राह्मण इति । वैदिकाः खल्वपि । शन्नोदेवीरभिष्टये । इषेत्वोर्जेत्वा । अग्निमीडे पुरोहितम् । अग्न आयाहि वीतये । इति । *(MB)*

Moreover, the Brāhmaṇas are the explanatory books on the Vedas. Here the Vedic stanzas are repeated and explained later on. Hence the Brāhmaṇas are the glosses on the Vedas. How can commentary be given

the same position as the original one ! For instance, while explaining the *Yajurveda* verse *tryāyuṣam*, etc. (III.62), the *Śatapatha* says :

1. अत्र वै चक्षुः जमदग्निः ऋषिः । यदनेन जगत् पश्यति, अथो मनुते । तस्मात् चक्षुः जमदग्निः ऋषिः । (*SB*. VIII.1) कश्यपो वै कूर्मः । प्राणो वै कूर्मः । (*SB*. VII.5)
2. इषेत्वोर्जेत्वा इति । वृष्टयै तदाह । यदाह इषेत्वोर्जेति । यो वृष्टात् अर्वाग् रसो जायते तस्मै तदाह, सविता वै देवानां प्रसविता । सवितृ-प्रसूताः । (*SB*. I.7)

Here we clearly find that the Vedic stanzas are being explained. Thus the Brāhmaṇas are merely a commentary on the Veda.

The very title of these books, i.e. Brāhmaṇa, indicates that these works are not the Vedas. Brahma means here Veda and their explanatory books are called Brāhmaṇas. The following instances may again prove it :

(a) The first verse of the *Yajurveda* is explained in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (I.7.1).

(b) The *Ṛgveda* verse (I.24.3) has been explained in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (I.16).

(c) The first verse of the *Sāmaveda* is explained in *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa* (XI.2.3).

Moreover, the four Vedas are the revealed books ; they are words of God ; but the Brāhmaṇas are human creation and were composed by sages.

As the Brāhmaṇas are man-made works, they contain criticism of other similar works. Sometimes they contain statements contradictory to each other. It clearly shows that they cannot be given the title of the Veda.

The accent plays essential part in the language of the Vedas while the same is lacking in the Brāhmaṇas.

The author of the *Mahābhāṣya* clearly declares that the Brāhmaṇa works were composed by the Brāhmaṇa seers who understood the four Vedas for the elucidation of the original text :

चतुर्वेदविद्भिः ब्राह्मणैः महर्षिभिः ब्राह्मणैः प्रोक्तानि यानि वेदव्याख्यानानि तानि ब्राह्मणानि । (V.I.1)

Kātyāyana, on whose authority Sāyaṇa includes the Brāhmaṇas in the Vedas, clearly distinguishes between the two in the following verse :

ओंकारो वेदेषु (I.18) अथकारं भाष्येषु (I.19) ।

In these quotations Kātyāyana himself creates distinction between the Veda and the Brāhmaṇa which he calls as Bhāṣya.

The evidence of Yāska, the author of the *Nirukta*, goes to establish the fact that the Brāhmaṇas are beyond the scope of the word Veda. He always quotes from the Vedas as *nigama* and the Brāhmaṇas are quoted separately as 'Brāhmaṇa' :

इत्यपि निगमो भवति । (V.3.3-4, 5.4, 8.9)

इति ब्राह्मणम् । (VII.12, XIII.10)

Yāska often disregards or shows a bit of contempt to Brāhmaṇas, but he has reverence for the Vedas always :

बहुभक्तिवादीनि हि ब्राह्मणानि भवन्ति । (*N*. VII.24)

He again quotes self-contradictory statement from the Brāhmaṇas, to which no stress or importance is to be attached. He says :

पृथिवी वैश्वानरः संवत्सरो वैश्वानरः ब्राह्मणो वैश्वानरः इति ।।
(*N*. VII.24)

The following quotation from Yāska states in clear terms that only the Mantras were revealed, and the tradition of oral transmission refers only to them :

साक्षात्कृतधर्माणः ऋषयो बभूवुः । तेऽवरेभ्यः असाक्षात्कृतधर्मभ्यः उपदेशेन मन्त्रान् सम्प्रादुः । (*N* I.20)

According to him, the Brāhmaṇas repeat what has already been ordained by the Mantras for the fuller explanation :

यथो एतत् ब्राह्मणेन रूपसम्पन्ना विधीयन्ते ।
इत्युदितानुवादः स भवति ।। (*N*. I.16)

The Brāhmaṇas are, therefore, *uditānuvāda* (i.e. repetition of what has already been ordained) and cannot claim the position of the original Veda.

Jaimini, the author of *Mīmāṁsā*, confirms this view by saying :

तच्चोदकेषु मन्त्राख्या । (XXXII)

शेषे ब्राह्मणशब्दः । (3.1.2)

अनाम्नातेषु अमन्त्रत्वम् । (3.1.3)

In *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* itself the Brāhmaṇas are separately stated from the Vedas :

इमे सर्वेवेदाः सब्राह्मणाः ।

Pāṇini, the great grammarian, has treated the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas as different from each other in the following aphorisms :

द्वितीया ब्राह्मणे । (*P.* II.3.60)

चतुर्थ्यर्थे बहुलं छन्दसि । (*P.* II.3.62)

पुराणप्रोक्तेषु ब्राह्मणकल्पेषु । (*P.* IV.3.105)

The last aphorism quoted above shows that the Brāhmaṇas and Kalpas which are the works of the ancient sages, Brahmā, etc., are Vedic glosses only. And for this reason they have been given the names of Purāṇa (and Itihāsa). If in these aphorisms the intention had been to call the Chandas and the Brāhmaṇas by the name Veda, the use of the word *chandas* in the above-mentioned aphorism would be meaningless, because the term Brāhmaṇa (which in that case would include the term *chandas*) had been already used in the first aphorism cited above. Thus it is clear that Pāṇini does not give the name of the Veda to Brāhmaṇas.

Moreover, the Brāhmaṇas and Upanisads are full of quotations from the Saṁhitās, the latter, though quoting from one another, do not quote a single line from the former.

In the light of this overwhelming evidence nothing but over-adultation and misdirected sense of reverence can lead one to place any other work on the same level as the Vedas. If the Vedas are looked upon as the revelation, it is a positive insult to them to give to any human book, however sublime and excellent, the same reverence as to them.

And none of the ancient masters has gone so far off, except Kātyāyana, whose position must be accounted for by his excessive reverence for all that facilitated the study of the Vedas.

CHAPTER VII

VEDAS INTERPRETED : A CRITICAL SURVEY

नावेदविन्मनुते तं बृहन्तम् । (*TB.* III.12.9)

[He, who does not know the Vedas, does not know him, who is great.]

Before we proceed to appreciate and form an estimate of the value of Dayānanda's interpretation of the Vedas, it would be quite logical to furnish an account of all efforts, made so far right from the Vedic period down to the age of Dayānanda in the sphere of understanding the Vedic texts. It will give us an opportunity to comprehend and critically examine the various types of interpretations offered by different translators at different times and under different circumstances.

INSPIRED SAGES

In the beginning, there were inspired sages who understood the Vedas, without being explained to them by any teacher or preceptor. They understood the purport of the Mantras without anybody's help, as the Vedas were revealed to them. We have already dealt, at greater length, this topic. Thus, there was no need of any gloss or exegesis during this period for them. Well-deserved homage is paid by Mr. R. T. H. Griffith to the Brahmins who committed the Vedas to memory and thus preserved them in their pristine purity.

Mr. Griffith says :

> "These four Vedas are considered to be of divine origin and to have existed from all eternity. The Ṛṣis, or the great poets to whom the hymns are ascribed, were merely inspired seers who saw or received them by sight and directly from the Supreme Creator. In accordance with this belief these sacred books have been preserved and handed with the most reverential care from generation to generation."
>
> (Translation of the *Ṛgveda*, Introduction)

From this it is clear that in the beginning there was no necessity of any gloss and exegesis for the understanding of the Vedas. The seers

understood them by insight. This fact has been clearly brought forth in his work, *Nirukta*, by Yāska in unambiguous terms :

साक्षात्कृतधर्माण ऋषयो बभूवुः । तेऽवरेभ्यो असाक्षात्कृतधर्मभ्य उपदेशेन मन्त्रान् सम्प्रादुः । उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तोऽवरे बिल्मग्रहणायेमं ग्रन्थं समाम्नासिषुः वेदं च वेदाङ्गानि च । (*N.* I.20)

Here it is definitely stated that Dharma (the Vedas) revealed itself to the seers. They handed it down by oral tradition (*upadeśa*) to their descendants to whom Dharma (the Veda) did not manifest itself. The others who declined (in understanding the Veda) by oral transmission compiled this book (the *Nighaṇṭu*) and the other Vedāṅgas for fuller understanding.

From this evidence we know that in the Saṁhitā-period, the purport of the Vedas was not obscure or difficult for the people to comprehend because the Vedas were revealed to them or taught to them (the younger generation) by those who knew them by insight. It is also a reason that the Vedic terminology was popularly known at that time. The spoken language at that time was not much distinct from the Vedic tongue.

During the course of time, gradually the later generations began to decline in intellect. I feel at this stage the internal comparative method was followed by them, where the words or context were not very clear. For instance, the word 'Aditi' has been used to denote a number of meanings in the Vedas. The confusion in such cases was natural. But if we refer rightly to Vedic text, we can easily come across such verses where various significances of this word are hinted upon :

अदितिर्द्यौरदितिरन्तरिक्षमदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्रः ।
विश्वेदेवा अदितिः पञ्चजना अदितिर्जातमदितिर्जनित्वम् ॥
(*RV.* I.6.16.5)

Here we get the various meanings of the word 'Aditi'.

It is beyond doubt that the Vedas themselves explain many controversial points. Does the worshipper invoke God or various elements of nature ? To this query, the Veda replies :

तदेवाग्निस्तदादित्यस्तद् वायुस्तदु चन्द्रमाः ।
तदेव शुक्रं तद् ब्रह्म ता आपः स प्रजापतिः ॥

[Even He is Agni, He is Āditya, He is Vāyu, He is Candramas ; He is Śukra, He is Brahma, He is Āpa, He is Prajāpati.] (*YV.* XXX.1)

इन्द्रं मित्रं वरुणमग्निमाहुरथो दिव्यः स सुपर्णोगरुत्मान् ।
एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः ॥

[They call Him Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni and He is beautifully-winged Garutmān (Sun). He is One. Sages call Him by many names, viz. Agni, Yama, Mātariśvān.]

Such verses are really internal interpretations of the Vedic texts and should be taken even now as the key to the interpretation of all apparently polytheistic expressions in the Vedas.

It served really as a keynote for interpreting the Vedas for Dayānanda, according to whom there is only one Supreme Being described in the Vedas and Agni, Indra, etc., are merely His different names expressing different qualities of the Supreme Lord.

PADA TEXTS

The creation of the Pada texts had twofold purpose first the preservation of the sanctity of Vedic text, and secondly to make the Vedic text clear and lucid by expounding the compounds, or by showing the position of accent on individual words and by inserting *avagraha* in the joint words. Prof. A. A. Macdonell maintains that the ancient sages adopted steps for preserving the Vedic texts with the faithfulness unique in history. Briefly stated, those steps were : (1) analysis of the whole text into words called Pada-pāṭha ; (2) Krama-pāṭha, i.e. reading every word twice, connected with both the preceding word and the word that follows ; (3) the woven text or Jaṭā-pāṭha stating each of the combinations three times, the second time in reverse order ; and (4) the climax of this precaution was reached in what was called Ghana-pātha in which the order of words is *ab, ba, abe, eba, abe ; be, cb, bed*, etc.

All these varieties of texts were learnt by heart and thus they preserved the sacred texts and helped to a great extent in understanding the exact significance of the text. The advantage of the Pada text in the sphere of the better understanding of the Vedic text has been accepted by Yāska in the following quotation :

अवसायपद्वते रुद्र मृळ । इति ।
अवतेर्गत्यर्थस्यासौ नामकरणः । तस्मान्नावगृह्णन्ति ।
अवसायाश्वान् । इति ।
स्यतिरुपसृष्टो विमोचने । तस्मादवगृह्णन्ति ॥ (*N.* I.17)

Explaining the last sentence here Durga adds—

इति पदकारा इति शेष: ।

These authors of the Pada texts were quite familiar with all etymological principles and grammatical formations ; because a layman who is a stranger to grammatical principles (even in the absence of grammatical works) cannot expound the compounds and disjoin words. It was the first attempt towards the understanding of the Veda Mantras. The authors of the Pada texts did not feel any necessity of writing a regular and running commentary on the Vedas. This fact shows that people at that time were not very much far off from the sages to whom Dharma manifested itsef (*sākṣat-kṛt-dharmāṇaḥ*).

THE ŚĀKHĀS (RECENSIONS)

It is quite well known that the 1,127 recensions of the Vedas are the Vedic exegesis. These recensions explain away the obscure words of the Vedas by substituting simpler words in different recensions differently. For instance, सचिविदं सखायम् । (*RV.* X.71.6) has been modified as सखिविदं सखायम् in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (I. 3). भ्रातृव्यस्य वधाय (*YV.* I.18) has been simplified in the Kāṇva recension as द्विषतो वधाय (I. 6.2.3). This shows that recensions contain simplified texts of the original Veda.

Instances can be multiplied. But it is certain that the recensions are helpful only to a little extent. The study of various recensions of the Vedic texts involves very hard labour, resulting in scanty utility. But the explanatory aspect of these recensions has been admitted by Veṅkaṭa Mâdhava in the *Ṛgbhāṣya Anukramaṇī* :

अध्यवस्यन्ति मन्त्रार्थान् एवं मन्त्रान्तरैरपि ।
शाखास्वन्यासु पठितैः विस्पष्टार्थैः मनीषिण: ।। (P. 77)

THE BRĀHMAṆA WORKS

The word Brāhmaṇa means first a single explanation given by a priest or a doctor of the science of Sacrifice upon any point of the ritual ; secondly it means a collection of such utterances and discussions in book form.

If we go over to the Brāhmaṇas and bring together all those passages which contain explanations of Saṁhitā texts or derivations of words, we shall have before us a large mass of material, which will prove to be an important contribution to the Vedic interpretation. Even to critical European scholars, such explanatory references found in the Brāhmaṇas have proved of much use to determine the meanings of words which are otherwise ambiguous or unintelligible.

The fact deserves notice that wherever we come across explanations of words and the Vedic verses, we find them invariably based on etymological meanings. Sometimes, no doubt, narratives of human beings and other legends are quoted here and there, but they are very few. Thousands of Vedic words have been critically examined and etymologically explained.

We must learn one thing from the explanations of the Vedic words given in the Brāhmaṇas that the Vedic words possess general sense and are not conventional or *rūḍhis*. This topic we shall deal at a proper place later on. Here it is sufficient to state that all the Vedic words according to the Brāhmaṇas denote general sense and not particular, i.e., they indicate only derivative significance. For instance, while explaining the following stanza from the *Yajurveda* :

त्र्यायुषं जमदग्नेः कश्यपस्य त्र्यायुषम् । (III. 62)

the *Śatapatha* says :

चक्षुर्वै जमदग्निः ऋषिः । यदनेन जगत् पश्यति । अथो मनुते । तस्माच्चक्षुः जमदग्निः । (*SB*. VIII.1)

कश्यपो वै कूर्मः । प्राणो वै कूर्मः । (*SB*. VII.5)

Again the first verse of the *Yajurveda* इषे त्वोर्जे etc., has been explained as :

इषे त्वोर्जेति—वृष्टयै तदाह । यदाह इषे त्वेति ऊर्जे त्वेति । यो वृष्टावूर्ग्रसो जायते तस्मै तदाह । सविता वै देवानां प्रसविता । सवितृ-प्रसूताः । (*SB*. I.7)

Sometimes Brāhmaṇas explain obscure words by offering simpler synonyms :

ब्रह्म वै ब्राह्मणः । क्षत्रं राजन्यः । (*SB*. XIII.1)

राष्ट्रं वा अश्वमेधः । (*SB*.)

Similarly Vedic metaphors have also been explained frequently :

प्रजापतिः वै स्वां दुहितरमभ्यध्यायत्, दिवमित्यन्य आहुः । उषसमित्यन्ये । तामृश्यो भूत्वा रोहितां भूतामभ्यैत् । तस्य यद् रेतसः प्रथममुददीप्यत् तदसावादित्योऽभवत् । (*AB*. III.33.34)

प्रजापतिः वै सुपर्णो गरुत्मानेष सविता । (*SB*. X.2)

Yāska, the author of the *Nirukta*, frequently quotes passages from the Brāhmaṇas in support of his own etymological explanations of the Vedic words.

Here we must understand that the Brāhmaṇa works are not regular commentaries on the Vedas. The main theme of these voluminous books is the Sacrifice (*yajña*) from which all discussions start and on which every thing hinges.

PRĀTIŚĀKHYAS AND ANUKRAMAṆĪS

The *Prātiśākhya* works are also an attempt in the same direction, though they relate more to the text and orthography than to the regular interpretation. Works like the *Sarvānukramaṇī* of Kātyāyana and the *Bṛhaddevatā* are important from the point of view of the preservation of the text only indirectly serving the purpose of Vedic interpretation.

THE NIGHAṆṬU AND THE NIRUKTA

The first and foremost distinct attempt to interpret the Vedic texts is the *Nirukta* of Yāska than which no older work of the type is known today. The *Nirukta* is a super-commentary on the *Nighaṇṭus*. The *Nighaṇṭus* are five lists of words which are divided into three sections. The first section (the Naighaṇṭuka Kāṇḍa) consists of three lists in which Vedic words are collected under certain ideas. For instance, there are quoted 21 names for earth, etc. That is, the first section contains lists of synonyms ; the second section (Naigama) contains a list of ambiguous and particularly obscure words of the Vedas ; while the third section (Daivata) gives a classification of the Devatās according to three regions, i.e. the earth, the atmosphere and the heaven. Vedic exegesis probably began with the compilation of such glossaries; the composition of commentaries on those glossaries, after the style of our *Nirukta*, with explanations of difficult Vedic verses interwoven, was a definite step in the development of the Vedic interpretation.

Tradition erroneously ascribes the *Nighaṇṭu* also to Yāska. In reality, however, Yāska himself says that the Nighaṇṭu (*imam grantham*)

was composed by the descendants of the ancient sages (*avare*) for the easier understanding of the transmitted texts. (*N.* I.20)

It is quite certain that Yāska had many predecesssors and his work, though surely very old and the oldest existing Vedic exegetic work, can nevertheless only be regarded as the last, perhaps also the most perfect production of the literature of the Vedāṅga Nirukta.

We must remember that although this work is very old, and also that no older work than this is extant in this sphere, yet it is far removed in age and spirit from the period of the Saṁhitās. This is quite evident from the fact that it makes twofold distinction while explaining the significance of words, i.e , it distinguishes between the use of words regarding their meanings prevalent in the Vedic language and in the spoken one. This shows a gap of many centuries between the period of revelation of the Vedas and that of Yāska. Thus for example in the section of *nipātas* (i.e. particles) he says :

इवेति भाषायां च उभयमन्वध्यायं च । अग्निरिवेन्द्र इवेति ॥
नेति प्रतिषेधार्थीयो भाषायाम् । उभयमन्वध्यायम् ॥

Here the distinction between the language of the Vedas and the language of daily speech in vogue at the time of Yāska is clearly hinted upon. The spoken language at that time was sufficiently different from the Vedic speech. The long elapse of time is the only justification for this.

This fact is again proved beyond doubt from the evidence of Kautsa who maintains that the Vedas do not convey or possess any meaning :

अथ निरर्थका मन्त्राः ।

[The Mantras have no sense.] (*N.* I.15)

To support his contention he advances arguments which clearly indicate the remoteness of Yāska's period from that of the Vedas when the sages did not feel any ambiguity in the Vedic text. The following are a few arguments given by Kautsa :

(a) The statements (in the Vedas) have certain fixed words and fixed order of words.

(b) The Brāhmaṇas endow the Mantras with forms ; thus—'Spread thyself widely out' (*YV.* I.22) ; 'and so he spreads' (*SB.* I.3.6.8).

(c) They speak what is incompatible; thus, "Protect him, plant", "axe, do not injure him," thus he speaks while striking.

(d) Their contents are self-contradictory as "There was but one Rudra and no second", and again "There are countless, thousands of Rudras on earth". So also "Indra, thou hast been born without a foe", and again "Indra vanquished a hundred armies at once."

(e) A person is ordained to do an act with which he is already acquainted; thus, "adress the hymn to the Fire which is being kindled". (This is said by the Adhvaryu to the Hotā).

(f) The significance of the Mantra is obscure on account of the words like *amyak* (*RV*. I.16.93), *yādṛśmin* (*RV*. V.44.8), *jārayāni* (*RV*. VI.12.4), *kāṇukā* (*RV*. VIII.66.4).

The last argument is a positive proof, establishing a fact that the tradition could not remain intact till Yāska's time. To meet these objections Yāska says :

(a) The Mantras have a sense, for their words are the same (as those in the ordinary language).

(b) The fixity of words and their order is also found in the case of our daily language, e.g., *indrāgnī*, *pitāputrau*.

(c) The Mantras being endowed with form by Brāhmaṇas cannot be a valid argument because the Brāhmaṇas repeat what has actually been already told by the Mantras.

(d) As for the enjoining of something impracticable, it depends on the statements of the Vedas, whether an act is *hiṁsā* or *ahiṁsā*.

(e) The contents of the Mantras are not self-contradictory. Such phrases occur in ordinary language : 'this Brāhmaṇa is without a rival', 'the king has no enemy'.

(a) अर्थवन्तः शब्दसामान्यात् । (*N*. 1.16)

(b) यथो एतत् नियतवाचोयुक्तयो नियतानुपूर्व्यो भवन्ति इति ।
लौकिकेष्वप्येतत्—इन्द्राग्नी, पितापुत्राविति । (*N*. 1.16)

(c) उदितानुवादः स भवति । (*N*. 1.16)

(d) यथो एतदनुपपन्नार्था भवन्ति—इत्याम्नायवचनात् अहिंसा प्रतीयते ।। (*N*. 1.16)

(e) लौकिकेष्वप्येतत् असपत्नोऽयं ब्राह्मणोऽनमित्रो राजेति ।

(f) As for the ordaining of something with which a man is already familiar, people are likewise greeted by their names, though they already knew them.

(g) As for the obscure significance of Vedic words, it is the fault of the post that the blind does not behold it; it is the man's fault. More knowledge is required for this purpose.

From this discussion, it is quite clear that in the days of Yāska, the sense of the Vedic hymns became obscure. One thing is also evident from Kautsa's statements that he held the Vedas in reverence and he admitted the efficacy of the Mantras. He only maintained that the Vedas have no significance.

There is again a point which invites our notice. When the Vedic glossaries in the form of Nighaṇṭus were compiled, it was not thought desirable to add a commentary to these lists of words ; because people could have needed only a very little help for understanding the Vedic text. This help was provided by the *Nighaṇṭu* without any commentary on it. But the time rolled on till the necessity of appending scientific and exhaustive commentaries was felt. When Yāska wrote his commentary, the Nighaṇṭus were regarded a poor help in the understanding of the Vedic text.

Prof. A. A. Macdonell thinks that Yāska did not possess a continuous tradition from the time "when the Vedic hymns were composed." The gap between the poets and Yāska must have been considerable. No doubt we find it amply proved by the divergences of opinion among his predecessors as quoted by him. Thus one of these, by the name Aurṇavābha, interprets the word *nāsatyau* as an epithet of Aśvins, as "True and False"; another Āgrāyana, as "Leaders of *Truth*" (*satyasya praṇetārau*), while Yāska himself thinks it may mean "nose-born" (*nāsikā prabhavau*).

Yāska, moreover, mentions several different schools of interpretations, each of which explained difficulties in accordance with its own particular theory. Yāska's own interpretations, which in all cases of doubt

---

(f) यथो एतत् जानन्तं संप्रेष्यतीति जानन्तमभिवादयते ।

(g) यथो एतत् अविस्पष्टार्था भवन्तीति नैष स्थाणोरपराधो यदेनमन्धो न पश्यति । पुरुषापराधः स भवति । भूयोविद्यः प्रशस्यते ॥ (*N.* I.16)

are based on etymology, are evidently often merely conjectural, for he frequently gives several interpretations of a word. Thus he explains the epithet *jāta-vedas* in as many as five different ways.

But all this is due to the fact that Yāska flourished at the time which was quite far away from the ancient seers.

Whether there was any regular tradition of the Vedic interpretations preserved throughout the period which must have elapsed between the Mantras on the one hand and the *Nirukta* on the other, it is very difficult to decide in the present condition of the Vedic studies. Though, Europeans may not regard Yāska as infallible, still they cannot altogether neglect the precious help they receive from him.

The position of Yāska as an interpreter of the Vedas, is very high. It is beyond doubt that he occupies a place which no other commentator can dream of. His contribution is solid and based on scientific method of interpreting the Vedas He is unrivalled in this domain. All commentators of all times to come, including Europeans, cannot move a step further without the help of the hidden treasure of the *Nirukta*, which is a source of inspiration to all. Roth, the founder of Philology, is erroneous in comparing Yāska with Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara who could not properly follow and understand precisely what Yāska had said, yet who tried their best to follow into the footprints of this great scholar of the Vedic learning. Yāska's explanations are based on etymology and tradition. It is wrong to say that Yāska had no regard for traditional interpretation. He always quotes from the Brāhmaṇas to support his derivative explanations. Even Roth himself has had to admit the greatness of Yāska over all other commentators :

> "He (Yāska) too is a learned interpreter, who works with materials which his predecessors had collected but he possesses an incalculable advantage, in point of time, over those compilers of detailed and continuous commentaries and belongs to quite a different period, viz., when Sanskrit was still undergoing a process of natural growth."

We are also not prepared to accept that Yāska's explanations are quite conjectural and not based on the Vedic traditions. Although there are a few cases where the derivations offered by Yāska appear to be fanciful (which, if we study them deeply, will undoubtedly prove to be right ones), still in a large number of cases Yāska's remarks are followed by *iti ha brāhmaṇam* or *iti vijñāyate*, which clearly indicates that the author possesses some basic traditions in support of which

he quotes passages. All these quotations could be traced but for the non-availability of the many Brāhmaṇas and the Śākhās. The Brāhmaṇa citations in the *Nirukta* have been collected and identified by Guṇe.[1]

A cursory reading of the *Nirukta* reveals that the Vedic studies were very popular at that time. The Vedas were read with great interest and devotion and a number of controversies regarding their meanings were current. Sometimes we find that the scholars held views quite opposed to each other. Therefore, we find that several older interpreters of the Vedas, both classes and individuals, are frequently mentioned by Yāska. But unfortunately none of their works are available now-a-days. The following are the schools of the Vedic interpreters referred to in the *Nirukta* :

1. The Nairuktas

Of these, the Nairukta is the most general name, meaning thereby the old expounders of the Veda of the same type as Yāska himself. The Nairukta school takes its stand on etymological derivations. They say that all nouns are derived from the verbal roots :

नामान्याख्यातजानि शाकटायनो नैरुक्तसमयश्च ।। (*N.* I.11)

["All nouns are derived from the roots", thus says Śākaṭāyana, and this is the view of the etymologists (the Nairuktas).]

But some grammarians (perhaps including Pāṇini) and Gārgya maintain that *na sarvāṇi* (*N.* I.11), i e. "not all", i.e. there are some nouns, e g. *rūḍhis,* which are not derivative.

2. Vaiyākaraṇas

Yāska also mentions his difference of opinion from the Vaiyākaraṇas (the grammarians) in the explanation of a Vedic stanza :

चत्वारि वाक् परिमिता पदानि । (*RV.* I.164.45)

According to the Nairuktas, the phrase, 'four-fold words', means "Ṛg, Yajur, Sāma and the worldly usage". But "the nouns, verbs, *upasargas* and *nipātas* (prefixes and particles) are the four kinds of words" according to the Grammarians. (*N.* XIII.9)

1. See "Bhandarkar Commemorative Volume".

3. Ārṣa

The third school is called Ārṣa. They explain the "four words" as ओंकार, and the Three Great Sayings (Mahāvyāhṛtis), i.e. *bhūḥ*, *bhuvaḥ* and *svaḥ*. (*N.* XIII.9)

4. The Yājñikas

According to the Yājñikas, i.e. the ritualists, the Mantras, Kalpas, Brāhmaṇas and the daily usages are the four kinds of words referred to in the *Nirukta*. (XIII. 9)

In addition to the exposition of the Veda in the stricter sense, there existed also liturgical interpretations of numerous passages such as we find in the Brāhmaṇas and other various treatises, in which it was attempted to bring the letter of the received text into harmony with the existing ceremonial. Such liturgical interpretations are called by Yāska, those of the Yājñikas. These Yājñikas in addition to an instance cited above have been referred to in the following cases :

(a) In the *Nirukta* (V.11) a Vedic verse एवया प्रतिधा (*RV.* VIII. 74.4) has been explained. According to Yājñikas here, the phrase *sarānsi trinśat* (i.e. thirty lakes) means *trinśat ukthapatrāṇi* (i.e. thirty *uktha-pātras*) while according to the Nairuktas it refers to :

त्रिंशत् अपरपक्षस्य अहोरात्राः त्रिंशत् पूर्वपक्षस्य ।

(h) According to the Yājñikas, a Mantra where no Devatā has been specified (*anirdiṣṭa-devatā*) belongs to a Devatā of the Sacrifice or of the part of the Sacrifice. In other cases all Mantras have Prajāpati as their Devatā. But the Nairuktas accept *nārā-śansa* as Devatā in such cases :

यद्देवतः स यज्ञो यज्ञांशो वा तद्देवता भवन्ति । अथान्यत्र यज्ञात् प्राजापत्या इति याज्ञिकाः नाराशंसा इति नैरुक्ताः ॥ (*N.* VII.4)

(c) *Anumati* and *rāka* are synonyms of *paurṇamāsī* (i.e. the full-moon night), while according to the Nairuktas they are *devapatnīs* (*N.* XI.29) (i.e. consorts of Gods).

(d) Similarly *sinīvālī* and *kuhū* are *amāvasyā* (i.e. the moonless night) according to the Yājñikas but the Nairuktas take them to mean *devapatnīs*. (*N.* XI.31.32)

(e) *Gau* is *dharma-dhuk* according to the Yājñikas but the same is "the thundering of the clouds" according to the Nairuktas. (*N*. XI.41)

Similar is in the case of the word *dhenu*. (*N*. XI.43)

5. The Ātmaprāvadās

According to this school, the utterances of the cattle, musical instruments, animals and of the Ātma (i.e. human beings) are four types of words. (*N*. XIII.9)

6. The Parivrājakas

This sect is referred to by Yāska while explaining the following Vedic stanza :

बहुप्रजा निर्ऋतिमाविवेश । (*RV*. I.164.32 ; *N*. II.8)

Here the Parivrājakas (the Saṁnyāsins) explain it as "A man with too many offsprings courts calamities" (बहुप्रजाः कृच्छ्रमापद्यते) while the Nairuktas interpret the word *nir-ṛti* as "the earth" and the word *bahu prajāḥ* as "plenty of clouds", i.e. the whole verse according to the Nairuktas refers to *varṣa-karma*. (*N*. II.1)

7. The Pūrva-Yājñikas

A school of the Pūrva-Yājñikas also existed which appears to mean the "earlier liturgists". According to them, the word *vaiśvānara* means the "Āditya" (i.e. the sun), while Yāska takes it in the sense of the "terrestrial fire". (*N*. 7.22)

The following few schools mentioned in the *Nirukta* more frequently are very important so far as the Vedic interpretation is concerned.

8. The Ākhyāna Samaya

Here the word *samaya* denotes the idea of a sect or tradition (*N*. I.11). While determining the form or appearance of the Devatās, Yāska refers to this school in the following words :

यथा वा पुरुषविधानामेव सतां कर्मात्मान एते स्युः ।
यथा यज्ञो यजमानस्य । एष चाख्यानसमयः ॥ (*N*. VII.7)

While discussing the appearances of the Devatās, Yāska offers four views : (1) that the Devatās have human forms or they are personal (Puruṣa Vidha); (2) they are impersonal (A-puruṣa Vidha); (3) thev are

of both the types ; (4) the fourth view is that which has been quoted above and according to this theory the Devatas may be personal sentient beings but they are manifested in the impersonal forms of Agni, Sūrya, etc., which are their "Karma-Ātmās", as the *yajamāna* is a sentient person and he is manifested in his *yajña*—the sphere of his activities.

In the opinion of Yāska, there is One Supreme Being and all other Devatas are His limbs only :

एकस्यात्मनो अन्ये देवाः प्रत्यङ्गानि भवन्ति । (*N*. VII.4)

In addition to the above quotation, the word आख्यान has been used in the *Nirukta* seven times in the following contexts :

(a) Yāska explaining the verse :

यो जात एव प्रथमो मनस्वान् ········स जनास इन्द्रः ।। (*RV*. II.12.1)

writes the following words :

ऋषेः दृष्टार्थस्य प्रीतिर्भवत्याख्यानसंयुक्ता ।

[Having visualised the (real) sense (of the Mantra) the seer takes delight (in finding) an आख्यान (i.e. symbolic story) associated with it.]

By this statement Yāska appears to convey that "the legends are associated with the Mantras." This is the cause of the metaphorical descriptions which we come across in the Vedas.

(b) The same sentence has been repeated in the *Nirukta* (X.46) under the verse :

एकः सुपर्णः स समुद्रमा विवेश । (*RV*. X.14.4)

In the following places we come across the reference to आख्यान :

(c) अथर्वाणः । भृगवः ।

माध्यमिको देवगणः इति नैरुक्ताः । पितर इत्याख्यानम् ।।

[The Atharvāṇas or Bhṛgus are the Devatās of aerial region according to the Nairuktas while they are *pitaras* according to Ākhyāna.] (*N*. XI.19)

(d) देवशुनी इन्द्रेण प्रहिता पणिभिः असुरैः समूद ।

इत्याख्यानम् ।। (*N*. XI.25)

["The witch sent by Indra had a talk with the *paṇis*." It is an Ākhyāna.]

(e) In *Nirukta* (XII. 41), Sādhyas are celestial beings according to the Nairuktas, while they are the Devatās of the earlier ages according to Ākhyāna.

साध्या द्युस्थानीया इति नैरुक्ताः । पूर्वं देवयुगमित्याख्यानम् । (*N*. XII.41)

(f) While explaining a verse (*RV*. I.8.16.1) from the *Ṛgveda*, Yāska quotes an Ākhyāna :

आह्वयत् उषा अश्विनावादित्येनाभिग्रस्ता । तामश्विनौ प्रमुमुचतुः । इत्याख्यानम् ।

[Uṣā, arrested by Āditya (i.e. sun), invoked Aśvins who rescued her. It is a (metaphorical) legend.] (*N*. V.21)

(g) Yāska explained (in the *Nirukta* (XI.34)) a verse from the *Ṛgveda* (X.10.14). Here he refers to an Ākhyāna :

यमी यमं चकमे । तां प्रत्याचक्ष । इत्याख्यानम् ।

[There is an Ākhyāna that Yamī (i.e. the night) requested Yama (i.e. the day) for intercourse. Yama did not accept.] (*N*. XI.34)

It is a (metaphorical) legend. Here Yama and Yamī are figuratively described as brother and sister. The Vedic verse denounces their marriage. According to the Nairukta (X.19) Yamī is the thundering sound of the lightning. The roar of the lightning has been figuratively described as a cry of an amorous woman. The natural phenomenon has been explained poetically and symbolically by the Ākhyānist. We must remember the already quoted words of Yāska regarding these legends :

ऋषेः दृष्टार्थस्य प्रीतिर्भवत्याख्यानसंयुक्ता ।

[The seer finds pleasure in giving a tinge of tale to what he has perceived and realised.] (*N*. X.10)

9. The Aitihāsikas

The Aitihāsikas are generally referred to while noticing differences in the conception of the Vedic Devatās. As interpreters they take the euhemeristic view, according to which the gods of mythology were generally deified mortals and their deeds the amplification in imagination of human acts. We shall discuss this topic separately later on.

10. The Naidānas

According to some scholars the mode of interpretation adopted by the Naidānas is akin to that of the Aitihāsikas. By this, we may

probably understand that this method of explanation referred to the origin of the words and conceptions, to occasions which were in a certain sense historical. But Durga explains this term as निदानमिति ग्रन्थः, तद्विदो नैदानाः, i.e. the Nidāna is a book ; persons who know it are called the Naidānas.

But we think that the Naidāna school was akin to the Nairukt ; as because from the *Nirukta*, where the view of this school is mentioned twice, it is clear in the following contexts that they were etymologists and not Aitihāsikas (i.e. historians).

(a) In the *Nirukta* (VI.9), the word *syāla* has been explained as *syālaḥ āsannaḥ saṁyogena iti naidānāḥ*.

Here the word has been etymologically explained by the Naidānas.

(b) The word *sāma* is explained by this school as ऋचा समं मेने इति नैदानाः (*N*. VII.12). Here too the Naidānas are quoted for their etymological explanation and nowhere else in the *Nirukta* these Naidānas are referred to.

Thus we can safely say that according to the *Nirukta*, there were ten schools of interpreters of the Veda during the time of Yāska.

In addition to these schools of thought, Yāska mentioned the following individual authorities by name in the *Nirukta* who were regarded as interpreters of the Vedas :

1. Āgrāyaṇa
2. Aupamanyava
3. Aurṇavābha
4. Krauṣṭuki
5. Gālava
6. Carma Śiras
7. Taitīki
8. Śatavalākṣa
9. Śākapūṇi
10. Son of Śākapūṇi
11. Sthaulāṣṭhivi
12. Kāthakya
13. Audumbarāyaṇa
14. Gārgya
15. Gārgyāyaṇi
16. Śākalya
17. Śākaṭāyana
18. Kautsa

IMPORTANCE OF THE AITIHĀSIKA SCHOOL

Yāska attaches great importance to the method of interpretation (of the Veda) adopted by the Aitihāsikas (i.e. the historians). This view has been mentioned side by side with the Nairuktas, almost in all cases. It can be legitimately presumed that the Aitihāsika method was next to the

Nairuktas in importance and popularity. Yāska refers to them or quotes their view showing contrast with the Nairuktas in the following words :

1. इत्यैतिहासिकाः—इति नैरुक्ताः ।
2. तत्रेतिहासमाचक्षते ।
3. तदभिवादिनी एषा ऋग्भवति ॥

The difference between these two views is that the words, which according to the Aitihāsikas are "proper nouns" indicating some persons or things or places, are common nouns according to the Nairuktas who depend upon the general sense or quality expressed by etymological method. To illustrate this difference and to show what sort of explanations and interpretations are attempted in the *Nirukta*, we cite below a passage from the *Nirukta* (II.16) which refers to the meaning of the word *vṛtra* :

तत् को वृत्रः ? मेघ इति नैरुक्ताः । त्वाष्ट्रोऽसुर इत्यैतिहासिकाः । अपां च ज्योतिषश्च मिश्रीभावकर्मणो वर्षकर्म जायते । तत्रोपमार्थेन युद्धवर्णा भवन्ति । अहिवत्तु खलु मन्त्रवर्णा ब्राह्मणवादाश्च । विवृद्ध्या शरीरस्य स्रोतांसि निवारयाञ्चकार । तस्मिन् हते प्रसस्यन्दिरे आपः ।

["Who was *Vṛtra* ?" "A cloud", say the Nairuktas (etymologists) ; "An *asura*, son of Tvaṣṭṛ," say the Aitihāsikas (story-tellers) ; the fall of rain arises from the mingling of the waters and of lightning. This is figuratively depicted as a conflict. The hymns and the Brāhmaṇas describe *vṛtra* as a serpent : by the expansion of his body, he blocked up the streams. When he was destroyed, the waters flowed forth.] (*N.* II.16)

From this statement it is quite evident that Yāska did not share the view of the Aitihāsikas. Because the Nairuktas hold that the Vedas which are revealed works and eternal do not contain stories of the mortal beings. Therefore, he gives derivation of every word, including the so-called proper nouns, e.g. *Vṛtra* and *Indra*, which according to the Nairukta school are 'a cloud' and 'the thunderbolt'. The phrase in the above-quoted citation, तत्रोपमार्थेन युद्धवर्णा भवन्ति, clearly points out that all these tales are figurative and denote some natural or spiritual aspect.

Instances can be multiplied but paucity of space does not permit too exhaustive a treatment. The following are the other places where Yāska has referred to the interpretations of the story-tellers ; of course, Yāska has his own interpretation based on etymological derivations there also ;

(a)	*N.* II.17	Legends.
(a)	*N.* II.17	*Ahi*—the serpent.
(b)	*N.* II.10	Devāpi and Śantanu.
(c)	*N.* II.24	Viśvāmitra and the Rivers.
(d)	*N.* XII.10	Saraṇyū.
(e)	*N.* I.5	Indra and Agastya.
(f)	*N.* X.25	Viśvakarman.

Now we give below a few principles (which Yāska enumerates) upon which the Nairuktas base their interpretation of the Vedic words :

(a) नामान्याख्यातजानि इति शाकटायनो नैरुक्तसमयश्च । (*N.* I.12)

That is, all Vedic words are derivative or *yaugika*. Thus according to him no word in the Veda is *rūḍhi*, i.e. conventional or proper noun. They indicate a general sense given by the etymology. Thus there is no scope for historians to smell a story here. Some scholars, taking into view a good number of explanations given by Yāska, wrongly conclude that Yāska was not sure about the meanings of words and thus he had no tradition behind. It is not just to say that Yāska who quotes Brāhmaṇas (*iti ha vijñāyate*) to support his view invariably had no tradition behind. The tentative explanations given by him cover the views of all schools because the Vedic words have no restricted meanings. The scope of the Veda is very vast and wide. Hence we are told in the *Manusmṛti* :

सेनापत्यं च राज्यं च दण्डनेतृत्वमेव च ।
सर्वलोकाधिपत्यं च वेद-शास्त्रविदर्हति ।। (*MS.* XII.100)

चातुर्वर्ण्यं त्रयो लोकाः चत्वारश्चाश्रमाः पृथक् ।
भूतं भविष्यं भव्यं च सर्वं वेदात् प्रसिद्ध्यति ।। (*MS.* XII.97)

सः सर्वोऽभिहितो वेदे सर्वज्ञानमयो हि सः । (*MS.* II.7)

Thus the sphere of the Vedic conception is unlimited and unrestricted. The Vedic words have general application. Hence Yāska himself says :

पारोपर्यवित्सु तु खलु वेदितृषु भूयोविद्यः प्रशस्यो भवति । (*N.* I.16)

(b) Yāska further declares that if we do not adhere to the *Nirukta* or its theory of interpretation, no clear idea of the Veda can be rightly understood. The study of the *Nirukta* leads to the right interpretation of the Vedas. He says :

अथापीदमन्तरेण मन्त्रेष्वर्थप्रत्ययो न विद्यते । (*N.* I.17)

(c) Yāska does not accept the existence of tales or legends in the Vedas. We have discussed this point above. The following citations deserve notice here :

तत्रोपमार्थेन युद्धवर्णा भवन्ति (*N.* II.16)

"The war descriptions are merely figurative," i.e., these statements do not depict any reality. The cause of adopting such figurative method is :

ऋषे दृष्टार्थस्य प्रीतिर्भवत्याख्यानसंयुक्ता । (*N.* X.10, 46)

Skandasvāmī in his commentary on the *Nirukta* (II. 78) says :

एवमाख्यानरूपाणां मन्त्राणां यजमाने नित्येषु च पदार्थेषु योजना कर्त्तव्या । एष शास्त्रे सिद्धान्तः, औपचारिको मन्त्रेष्वाख्यानसमयः । परमार्थेन नित्यपक्षः इति सिद्धम् ।

Tbat is, the legendary method followed in the Mantras is only figurative. In reality eternity (of the Veda) is the view of the Nairuktas.

Similarly in the *Niruktasamuccaya* (p. 71) we are told :

औपचारिकोऽयं मन्त्रेष्वाख्यानसमयः ।

Durga also remarks :

स पुनरयमितिहासः सर्वप्रकारो हि नित्यमविवक्षितस्वार्थः । तदर्थप्रतिपत्तॄणामुपदेशपरकत्वात् । (*N.* X.26)

[Here the Itihāsa does not express any meaning. Its aim is to teach some moral to those who accept their meaning.]

(d) Yāska does not attach too much importance to the case-endings and accents. The etymologist must give a sensible interpretation. He should aim at the meaning even at the cost of case-endings and accents. He says :

अर्थो नित्यः परीक्षेत । (*N.* II.1)

यथार्थं विभक्तीः सन्नमयेत् । (*N.* II.1)

कथमनुदात्तप्रकृति नाम स्यात् । दृष्टव्ययं तु भवति । (*N.* I.8)

पञ्चम्यर्थे प्रथमा वा । (*N.* VI.1)

(e) In the *Nirukta* (V. 21) the word मासकृत् occurring in the *Ṛgveda* (I. 7.23.3) has been interpreted as मास+कृत् (i.e. maker of months) and also as मा-सकृत् (i.e. once me). This shows that Yāska does not adhere too much to the Pada text. His aim is to give the exact and real meaning.

(f) Yāska does not always adhere to the theory that the *liṅga* (i.e the word occurring in the Mantra) is the Devatā. The implied sense of the word is also regarded as Devatā in a Mantra. In the *Nirukta* (IX.11) a *ratha* (the word which does not occur in the Mantra) is accepted as its Devatā because it is conveyed by the word *vanaspati* there.

(g) In his commentary on the *Nirukta*, Skandasvāmī declares that every Mantra has triple sense—*ādhyātmika*, *ādhidaivika* and *ādhiyajñika*. He says :

सर्वदर्शनेषु सर्वे मन्त्रा योजनीयाः । कुतः ? स्वयमेव भाष्यकारेण सर्व-मन्त्राणां त्रिप्रकारस्य विषयस्य प्रदर्शनाय "अर्थं वाचः पुष्पफलमाह ।"
(*N.* I.20)

इति यज्ञादीनां पुष्पफलत्वेन प्रतिज्ञानात् । (*N.* VII.5)

(h) **Tarka as a seer :**

We cannot leave this topic without citing the following passage from the twelfth section of the 13th Chapter of the *Nirukta*, which implies antiquity of the Mantras and the necessary qualifications for inter preting them :

अयं मन्त्रार्थचिन्ताभ्यूहोऽभ्यूळहः । अपि श्रुतितोऽपि तर्कतः । न तु पृथक्त्वेन मन्त्रा निर्वक्तव्याः । प्रकरणश एव तु निर्वक्तव्याः । न ह्येषु प्रत्यक्षमस्ति—अनृषेः । अतपसो वा पारोपर्यवित्सु तु खलु वेदितृषु भूयोविद्यः प्रशस्यो भवति । इत्युक्तं पुरस्तात् । मनुष्या वा ऋषीषूत्क्रामत्सु देवान् अब्रुवन् । को न ऋषिः भविष्यति इति । तेभ्यः एतं तर्कमृषिं प्रायच्छन् । मन्त्रार्थचिन्ताभ्यूहमभ्यूळहम् । तस्मात् यदेव किञ्चानूचानोऽभ्यूहति-आर्षं तद् भवति । (*N* XIII 12)

[The reflective deduction of the sense of the Mantras is effected by the help of oral tradition and reasoning. The Mantras are not to be interpreted as isolated but according to their contexts, for a person, who is not a seer or a devotee, has no intuitive insight into their meaning. We have said before that among those who are versed in tradition, he who is more learned deserves specific praise. When the Ṛṣis (seers) were ascending, men inquired of the gods, "Who shall be seer (Ṛṣi) ?" The gods gave them for a seer, (the science of) reasoning ; the act of deducting by reflection the sense of the hymns. Therefore, whatever meaning any learned man deduces by reasoning possesses authority equal to Ṛṣis.]

Roth regards the 13th Chapter of the *Nirukta*, where this passage occurs, as a work of some author subsequent to Yāska. But there is sufficient proof to establish that the ancients definitely admitted the necessity of Reason in the determination of religious truth of the interpretation of important or obscure scriptural texts. From this passage it is quite clear that the inductive method of interpretation was fully known to the ancients, including Yāska.

PĀṆINI AND PATAÑJALI

No doubt, Yāska refers to some grammarians in his work and there had been many grammarians before Yāska, but their works could not survive. Pāṇini's great *Aṣṭādhyāyī* perhaps eclisped all of them. Patañjali mentions 18 aims of studying grammar; one of them is the safe preservation of the Vedas : **रक्षार्थं वेदानामध्येयं व्याकरणम्**. But still Pāṇini's grammar mainly deals with the classical Sanskrit, i.e. the language spoken in the higher circles of the society of his period. He also treats Vedic forms as only irregularities or where they differ from the spoken language. He also states that the "subjunctive" (*leṭ*) was used in the Vedic language only.

Dayānanda has quoted a few aphorisms from Pāṇini in his Bhūmikā to show the treatment of Vedic words as given by this great sage.

Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* on occasions beyond number clearly admits all the principles of interpreting the Vedas which have been laid down by Yāska.

Yāska says, **यथार्थं विभक्तीः सन्नमयेत्**, while Pāṇini echoes the same things as **बहुलं छन्दसि सव्यत्ययो बहुलम्** . The author of the *Mahābhāṣya* (Patañjali) elucidates these aphorisms in the following verse :

सुप्तिङुपग्रहलिङ्गनराणां कालहलच्स्वरकर्तृयङां च ।
व्यत्ययमिच्छति शास्त्रकृदेषां सोऽपि च सिद्ध्यति बाहुलकेन ॥

Thus we come to the maxim which Yāska gives in the *Nirukta* : **अर्थं नित्यः परीक्षेत न संस्कारमाद्रियेत**, i.e., the interpreter should always attach importance to the sense and he should not care for the particular grammatical formations, because the logical interpretation is the supreme aim.

THE PŪRVAMĪMĀṀSĀ

It is one of the six systems of philosophy of ancient India. Its aim, in the words of Colebrooke, is "the interpretation of the Vedas". Soma Nātha also says in his work, the *Mayūkhamālā* :

> "Its purpose is to determine the sense of the Revealed Speech."

But in reality the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* does not interpret the Vedic text in the manner of a commentary. It only lays down rules and canons for the proper application of the liturgical texts and for the ascertainment of the relative position and importance of the texts where they are mutually inconsistent. The following quotation is a fine specimen of the rules and canons which are laid down by the Mīmāṅsakas for this purpose :

श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पारदौर्बल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षात् ।

[Direct mention, a mere indicatory mark, a sentence, context, order, or place of mention and etymology ; when any of these circumstances referring to the same text leads to inconsistent conclusions, every following circumstance is weaker than every preceding one, and therefore must yield to it.]

PREDECESSORS OF SĀYAṆA

There were 16 interpreters of the Vedic texts who flourished before the advent of the great commentator Sāyaṇa. From a cursory study of their works it becomes quite evident that the vital and all inclusive method of interpretation adopted by Yāska and his predecessors was long forgotten now. The predecessors of Sāyaṇa took it for granted that the whole Vedic text meant nothing but rituals. It was a wrong notion, under which these writers toiled hard and produced commentaries referring to nothing but the sacrificial process. Yāska did not cherish this false notion. His explanations are general and *ādhidaivika.* We never come across a single instance from the *Nirukta* where explanation of a particular text refers to the ritual performance. Thus we find that gradually the significance of the Vedas was made narrower and narrower.

The following 16 commentators preceded Sāyaṇa :

1. Skandasvāmī
2. Durga (in the commentary of the *Nirukta*)
3. Udgītha
4. Harisvāmī (in the *Śatapatha*)
5. Uvvaṭa (*Yajurveda Bhāṣya*)
6. Vararuci (in the *Niruktasamuccaya*)
7. Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara (*Taittirīya Saṁhitā & Taittirīya Bhāṣya*)
8. Veṅkaṭa Mādhava (*Ṛg Bhāṣya*)
9. Ātmānanda (*Asya Vāmīya Bhāṣya*)
10. Ānanda Tīrtha (40 hymns of the *Ṛgveda*)

11. Śatrughna (in *Mantra Dīpikā*)
12. Guṇaviṣṇu (*Chāndogya Mantra Bhāṣya*)
13. Mādhava (*Sāmaveda*)
14. Bharatasvāmī (*Sāmaveda*)
15. Devapāla (in the Bhāṣya of (*Laugakṣī Gṛhya*)
16. Ānandabodha (Kāṇva Śākhā)

To this list Nara Sinh Yati is to be added (Jayatīrtha Tīkā and Chalāri Tīkā).

17. Sāyaṇa (Ṛ.g., Sāma, Atharva and Kāṇva Śākbā).

1 & 2. Skandasvāmī and Durga

The earliest commentary available on the *Ṛgveda*, after Yāska, was written by Skandasvāmī, who was also the author of a commentary on the *Nirukta*. Durga's Bhāṣya on the *Nirukta* is also very popular. Both these scholars can rightly claim a very high place among the interpreters of the Vedas.

The following few points, related to the method of interpreting the Vedic text, are common to both of them. These are the basic principles, which were shown by Yāska (quoted by us above) and which were gradually forgotten or neglected by the later writers of the Vedic commentaries.

(a) According to Yāska all the hymns or Mantras have triple meanings. They should and can be interpreted to denote the three types of significance, i.e., the *ādhyātmika*, *ādhidaivika* and *ādhiyājñika*. Skanda and Durga, both hold this view and they clearly express this fundamental principle in unambiguous terms.

Skanda says :

सर्वदर्शनेषु च सर्वे मन्त्रा योजनीयाः । कुतः ? स्वयमेव भाष्यकारेण त्रिप्रकारस्य विषयस्य सर्वमन्त्राणां प्रदर्शनाय ।। अर्थं वाचः पुष्पफलमाह (*N*. I.25) इति यज्ञादीनां पुष्पफलत्वेन प्रतिज्ञानात् ।। (*SK. N*. VII.5; *Bhāṣya* III, pp. 36,37)

[All Mantras are to be interpreted according to all systems of philosophy ; because the Bhāṣyakāra (Yāska) himself has declared that all Mantras imply three meanings, as he has stated that sense is the flower and fruit of the (revealed) speech, i.e., the *yajñas*, etc., are the *puṣpaphalas* (of the Vedic words).]

Similarly Durga echoes the same purport in more explicit terms :

तत्रैवं सति प्रतिविनियोगमस्य अन्येनार्थेन भवितव्यम् । त एते वक्तुरभिप्रायवशात् अन्यत्वमपि भजन्ते मन्त्राः । न ह्येतेषु अर्थस्येयत्तावधारणमस्ति । महार्था ह्येते

दुष्परिज्ञानाश्च । यथाश्वारोहवैशिष्ट्यवशात् अश्वः साधुः साधुतरश्च भवति, एवमेते वक्तृवैशिष्ट्यात् साधून् साधुतराश्चार्थान् स्रवन्ति ।

तत्रैवं सति लक्षणोद्देशमात्रमेवैतस्मिन् शास्त्रे निर्वचनमेकैकस्य क्रियते । क्वचिच्चा- ध्यात्माधियज्ञाधिदैवोपदर्शनार्थम् । तस्मादेतेषु यावन्तोऽर्था उपपद्येरन् आधिदैवा- ध्यात्माधियज्ञाश्रयाः सर्व एव ते योज्याः । नात्रापराधोऽस्ति । (*N.* II.8)

[Interpretations of the Mantras vary corresponding to the various applications. (The sense) of the Mantras changes in accordance with the intention of the user because the power of expression (of the hymns) has never been restricted. They have unlimited implications and are hard to be fully comprehended. As a good or a better horseman makes a horse good or better, so the Mantras denote good or better senses when they are handled by a learned or a more learned interpreter.

Thus the explanations of words given in this treatise are only indicative and suggestive of other meanings. They have the *ādhyātmika*, *ādhidaivika* and *adhiyajña* applications. Therefore, whatever meaning appears to be reasonable (pertaining to any category of the above-mentioned meanings) should be accepted as right. None should find fault here.]

Again on page 211, he writes : प्रकरणमात्रमेवेदमुपदर्शितं भाष्यकारेण, i.e., "the Bhāṣyakāra (Yāska) has shown only the way (of interpretations)." Again in the *Nirukta* (VII. 6) Durga repeats the same theme in different words.

These two citations from Skanda and Durga make it quite clear that the system and the procedure of interpreting hymns in the above-noted three systems, which were very common with Yāska, have come down to Skanda and Durga also. Both these scholars have clearly declared here that the Mantras are to be interpreted in three different manners. But we shall see later on that this tradition or convention of the earlier Vedic scholars could not reach Sāyaṇa, the great commentator of the Vedas who interpreted the Vedas only according to Mīmāṁsaka school.

(b) The other common point between Skanda and Durga is that they accept the principle that *svara* (accent) and *saṁskāra* (particular grammatical formations) should not be much adhered to while explaining a word or stanza. It is only the sense which should play a predominant role here. Durga says :

(i) एवं व्याकरणेऽपि लक्षणप्रधाने सति अर्थवशेन लोपागमो विपरिणामश्च शब्दानां दृष्टः । किमुत निरुक्ते यदर्थप्रधानमेव ॥ (*N.* II.2; Tīkā, p. 102)

(ii) अर्थनित्य इत्युक्तेऽर्थप्रधान इति गम्यते । अर्थप्राधान्येन अनादृत्य स्वरसंस्कारौ परीक्षेत । (*N*. II.1; Ṭīkā, p. 97)

(iii) मन्त्रार्थपरिज्ञानादेव हि अग्नेराध्यात्मिकाधिदैवाधियज्ञेष्ववस्थानं याथात्म्यतो दृश्यते । (*N*. IV.19; Ṭīkā, p. 315)

Skanda also shares this view and adds :

रूढ्यर्थस्य असम्भवात् कर्म-निमित्तो यथा प्रतीयेत इत्येवमर्थम् ।

[Conventional (*rūḍhi*) meanings are impossible (in the Vedas). Hence attempt should be made to discover the derivative sense.]

(*N*. I.15; Ṭīkā, p. 92)

The same principle has been followed by Durga in the Ṭīkā (pp. 276, 324). All this goes to show that in explaining the Vedas conventional method should not be followed but care should be taken to adopt the method of etymological explanation.

(c) The third point of similarity between these two scholars is that both of them accept the view of the *Nirukta* that the Vedas do not contain any human story or any other story. They are followers of the Nairukta school referred to already.

3. Udgītha (687)

He is also a follower of the Nirukta school and his Bhāṣya is similar to that of Skanda. He also accepts the *yaugikavāda*. Following the method of the etymologists, he interprets the word ऋषि as रश्मि while explaining the verse (*RV*. X.82.3) यत्रा सप्तऋषीन् पर एकमाहुः ।

4. Harisvāmī

He was a pupil of Skanda and accepts his teacher's views. He did not write any commentary on a Saṁhitā but only on the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, which has come down to us only in one fragmentary manuscript. We have cited above from this MS (p. 2) a passage showing that the Śākhās are the glosses of the Vedas.

5. Uvvaṭa

His Bhāṣya on the *Yajurveda* is chiefly *ādhiyajña* but in the following places we get the "triple meanings" :

YV. VII. 42, *YV*. X. 16, *YV*. XXXIII. 74.

6. Vararuci

He is the author of the *Niruktasamuccaya*, which is only available in quotations by Skanda. He also declares that निरुक्तप्रक्रियानुरोधेण मन्त्रा निर्वक्तव्याः,. i.e., "the Mantras are to be explained in accordance with the Nairukta school."

7. Bhaṭṭabhāskara (11th century A.D.)

He wrote commentaries on the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*. His style is akin to that of Sāyaṇa. We come across some very interesting derivative meanings of some words given in the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* :

(a) गावो = गन्तारः । (Vol. I, p. 296)

(b) यज्ञं = परमात्मानम् । (Vol. II, p. 104)

(c) कक्षीवन्तम् = ईश्वरम् ॥ (Vol. II, p. 194)

He accepts the principle of interchange in accent and grammatical formations, e.g., case-endings.

8. Veṅkaṭa Mādhava

He wrote a Bhāṣya on the *Ṛgveda* and follows the Yājñika school. His commentary is very brief. His Bhāṣya is full of informations regarding accents, etc. A comprehensive commentary by Mādhava on the *Ṛgveda* has been published from Adyar.

9. Ātmānanda (1200-1300 V. E.)

He wrote an exhaustive commentary on a hymn beginning with the verse *Asya Vāmīya*. He refers to Skanda and others (on p. 3) and says that they interpreted Vedas on the lines of Yājñikas but he would give the *ādhyātmika* interpretations only. Again on p. 60 he writes :

अधियज्ञविषयं स्कन्दादिभाष्यम् । निरुक्तमधिदैवतविषयम् ।
इदन्तु भाष्यमाध्यात्मविषयम् । न च भिन्नविषयाणां विरोधः ।

[The Bhāṣyas of Skanda, etc., are *adhiyajña* (i.e. contain liturgical explanations) while the sphere of the *Nirukta* is *adhidaivata* (i.e. pertaining to physical forces). But this commentary of ours is *adhyātma* (i.e. refers to the self or soul).]

According to him, the word *agni* means *agraṇī*, i.e., Supreme Being.

10. Ānandatīrtha (1255-1335 V.E.)

He wrote a commentary on the first 40 hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. Jayatīrtha added a gloss to this commentary and this gloss has been again elucidated by another commentary called "Chalāri" by Narasiṁhapati. Here Viṣṇu is the chief God and all Mantras are addressed to him.

Ānandatīrtha and Jayatīrtha accept the triple significance of the Mantras. The latter clearly writes :

निरुक्तव्याख्यानं बाह्यकर्मपरम् । उपनिषद्व्याख्यानमध्यात्मपरम् । विशेषतश्च वेदानां भगवान् ऋषिः । (p. 6)

In the Chalāri Ṭīkā also we get such remarks in the similar words.

Rāghavendra Yati followed this principle in his *Mantrārtha Mañjarī* and remarked :

अग्न्यादिदेवतापरत्वेन अध्यात्मपरत्वेन च इत्येवं अर्थपरतया व्याख्यानानि । (p. 2)

Here the Mantras have been explained in the above-said three ways. Again he supports his interpretation by adding the following remarks :

विष्णुः सर्ववेदप्रतिपाद्यः सर्ववेदानां विष्णवर्थत्वसिद्धेः ।

Viṣṇu (i.e. the Omnipresent and All Pervading Soul) is the main theme of all the Vedas as all the Vedas lead to the realisation of the Omnipresent Lord (Viṣṇu).

It deserves notice here that all the post-Yāska interpreters of the Vedas, including Sāyaṇa, explained the Vedas only in the liturgical sense, except Ātmānanda and Ānandatīrtha to whom the entire credit of preserving the process of triple Vedic interpretation goes. Only these two scholars continued the old tradition of *ādhyātmika* explanation, in spite of the fact that their sphere was very limited and they interpreted only a very small part of the Veda.

11. Śatrughna

He is the author of the *Mantrārtha-Dīpikā*. He follows the method of etymological explanation and shares the view that the Vedas contain three kinds of significance in every verse. The following citation shows that the Supreme Being who is One without a second is worshipped and glorified by various names in the Vedas :

यः देवः पुरुषः परमात्माध्येयत्वेनोक्तः तस्य प्रशंसार्थं नानारूपैरुपासनं दर्शयति । "तमेतमिति" यः पुरुषः उक्तः स परमात्मेति व्याख्येयः । (p. 250)

12. Guṇaviṣṇu

He is the follower of the Mīmāṁsā school and all Mantras according to him refer to some sacrificial aspect. On page 116 of his *Chāndogya-mantrabhāṣya,* he states : **विनियोगो ब्रह्मयज्ञे,** i.e., the Mantra has its application to the Brahmayajña, and it is the only instance where he has shown a little departure from the traditional application.

13. Mādhava

He wrote commentary on the *Sāmaveda.*

14. Bharatasvāmī (1350 V. E.)

He, like Mādhava, wrote commentary on the *Sāmaveda.* Both these commentators have the same notions about the Vedic interpretation. For instance, they explained the word *atri* as *adana-śīla* on pp. 17 and 61 respectively.

15. Devapāla

He explained and interpreted a few Vedic stanzas, quoted in the commentary of *Laugākṣigṛhyasūtra.* On pages 27, 55, 57 and 60, he accepted the *ādhyātmika* and *ādhidaivika* significance of the Vedas. Hence he interpreted the words *Indra* and *Āditya* as Supreme Lord.

Besides the above-mentioned predecessors of Sāyaṇa, the following minor Bhāṣyakāras also deserve a little notice here :

16. **Ānandabodha** (*Kaṇva Śākhā*)

17. **Anantācārya** (*Yajurmañjarī*)

18. **Mudgala** (*Pāraskaramantrabhāṣya*)

19. **Veṅkaṭeśa** (*Taittirīya Saṁhitā*)

From this critical examination of these Vedic commentaries, it is quite evident that the predecessors of Sāyaṇa maintained and preserved the old tradition of interpreting hymns in the 'Triple-Process'. Unfortunately this time-honoured tradition could not reach Sāyaṇa, the great interpreter of the Vedas, who gave invariably sacrificial explanations everywhere.

ĀCARYA SĀYAṆA

The most important contributions to the Vedic exegesis (after Yāska) were made by the great Sāyaṇa, who wrote Bhāṣyas on all the four Vedas. His *Vedārthaprakāśa* is a regular commentary on the *Ṛgveda,* and has a very informative and learned introduction.

In this commentary, the author has paraphrased each and every word in the text. All grammatical peculiarities, along with etymological derivations of obscure words, are given at proper places. He has also explained the liturgical application of each and every verse. It is unfortunate that Sāyaṇa believed that the entire Vedic text is related to *yajñas* or rituals. He has therefore taken special pains to explain each and every verse in accordance with the ritualistic school. Even the secular hymns have been shown possessing some sacrificial applications. He openly declared that the Vedas have no other purpose than sacrifices :

आध्वर्यवस्य यज्ञेषु प्राधान्यात् व्याकृतः पुरा ।
यजुर्वेदोऽथ होत्रार्थमृग्वेदो व्याकरिष्यते ॥

Thus his scope of interpretation is very narrow and limited. Yāska has never restricted the Vedas to one particular view or at least to the Ādhiyājñika school. We have proved above that Skanda and Durga admitted the triple process of interpretation of the Vedas.

Sāyaṇa was the minister of Bukka Raya, the king of Vijayanagar (now in ruins) near Hampi on the Tungabhadrā river. Bukka and Harihara were brothers and founded the empire of Vijayanagar about the middle of the 14th century A D. It was under their patronage that Sāyaṇa and his brother Mādhava, who was regarded as Guru by the princes, did all their literary activities. Sāyaṇa's other works are :

(a) Commentary on *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*

(b) Commentary on *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*

(c) Commentary on *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*

Professor Macdonell has pointed out some principles of modern criticism which according to him would have been entertained by Sāyaṇa while interpreting the Vedas. These rules of higher criticism ought to have been adopted and followed. Thus the commentary of Sāyaṇa, viewed from this standpoint, is full of defects, and this cannot be denied. But before criticising Sāyaṇa on this point, we must take into consideration the basic idea of Vedic conception held by the author. It would be unfair to criticise him without properly understanding h m. To Sāyaṇa, the Veda was a holy book—a store-house of wisdom, secular and philosophical, whose authority was not to be questioned. Every word of it was sacred and consequently it was not possible for him to apply the rules of modern criticism to it.

From the critical examination of his commentary we can safely say that no living tradition relating to Vedic interpretation has reached Sāyaṇa. In case an obscure word occurs, he is indefinite about its meanings. He would propose more than one significance without giving his preference. Sometimes he connects verb with a subject without agreement in point of person or number. He also believes in धातूनामनेकार्थत्वम्, i.e., a root has more than one meaning. This principle has been adopted by him times without number to serve his purpose. Like Yāska, he depends chiefly upon the derivative meaning. He finds no hesitation to add a word or words to make the sense complete.

He invariably quotes passages from the Sarvānukramaṇī, the *Bṛhaddevatā*, Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas. Wherever possible he cites from the *Nirukta* in the words : अत्र निरुक्तम् .

There is great self-contradiction in Sāyaṇa, regarding the Vedic legends. In his Upodghāta he refuted his opponent, who criticised the Vedic text as full of human legends and stories and thus it could not be regarded as revealed and eternal, by saying that the Vedas did not contain human and other tales. The Vedic words are used to denote general sense, i.e., these words are not proper nouns but are common nouns implying common quality of a person or a thing. In support of his theory, he cited a few aphorisms from the Mīmāṁsā, e.g., परन्तु श्रुतिसामान्यमात्रम् ; आख्या प्रवचनात् ; उक्तन्तु शब्दपूर्वत्वम् ; quoted by us already. Then he proceeds to explain the significance of the so-called historical words or proper nouns by taking their etymological derivative sense. Thus according to him, the Vedas do not contain tales or myths. But it is a strange feature that he forgets all at once this forcibly established theory, while actually he comments upon the Vedic text. This self-contradiction is very hard to reconcile. Not only this, but he explains the so-called Vedic myths in the light of later Paurāṇika ideas with whose influence, of course, he is strongly imbued. Thus Paurāṇika influence is sometimes too much to be found in him. Thus while explaining the occasion of certain hymns, Sāyaṇa quotes legends which are absolutely unrelated to and incongruous with the spirit of the hymns. One instance I would cite here, which will indicate that the sense of the hymns was altogether forgotten or not completely comprehended. In hymn X. 121 the last words of every verse are कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम, which literally mean : "What God should we adore with an offering ?" It is a natural and simple question or a yearning of the human heart to search after that God who is the origin of this universe, the first seed and the shaper of all life

and is one without a second (एक आसीत्). There is a natural desire in every human heart to know that Un-knowable.

Now Sāyaṇa explains this word *kasmai* and the hymn in a Paurāṇika way. Here he remarks : 'क' शब्दाभिधेयाप्रजापतिदेवता, i.e., the god Prajāpati is expressed by the word *ka* here. As we already pointed out, every hymn, every verse, must have a reference to a sacrifice and thus must have a deity according to him. For this purpose he goes as far as to discover a deity where none exists. He, therefore, raised the most ordinary things, e.g., stones, drums, grass and axe, to the artificial rank of deities. Following this principle Sāyaṇa here, neglecting altogether the real sense of the whole hymn and the deep yearning of the devotee or a poet for the unknown God, raises the interrogative pronoun itself to the rank of deity and admits a god *ka* or 'who ?' In his commentary he gives the following introductory remarks to this hymn :

> अत्र किं शब्दोऽनिर्ज्ञातस्वरूपत्वात् प्रजापतौ वर्त्तते । यद्वा सृष्ट्यर्थं कामयते इति कः । कमेःऽप्रत्ययः । यद्वा कं सुखं ; तद्रूपत्वात् क इत्युच्यते । अथवा इन्द्रेण पृष्टः प्रजापतिः मदीयं महत्त्वं तुभ्यं प्रदाय अहं कः कीदृशः स्यामिति । स इन्द्रः प्रत्यूचे । यदीदं ब्रवीषि अहं कः स्यामिति । तदेव त्वं भवेति । अतः कारणात् क इति प्रजापतिराख्यायते ।

Thus we see here four different explanations attributed to the word *ka*.

The notion, that the Vedas were written simply for the sake of sacrifices and that whatever interpretation is fit for sacrifices can be assigned to these hymns, has vitiated the whole system of Vedic exegesis in India.

As every thing looks yellow to a jaundiced person, so Sāyaṇa smells sacrifices in every word of the Veda. The very ordinary words which have not even the remotest sense of sacrificial acts, e.g., *jana*, *manuṣya*, *jantu*, *nara*, *viṭ*, *martta*, etc., (which mean a man or group of men) have been explained as Yajamāna, i.e., a sacrificer. For instance :

(a) RV. I.60.4 मानुषेषु=यजमानेषु
(b) RV. I.68.4 मनोरपत्ये=यजमानरूपायां प्रजायाम्
(c) RV. I.128.1 मनुषः=मनुष्यस्य यजमानस्य
(d) RV. I.140.12 जनान्=यजमानान्
(e) RV. V.16.2 जनानाम्=यजमानानाम्
(f) RV. I.31.15 विशाम्=यजमानरूपाणां प्रजानाम्
(g) RV. III.8.5 नरः=कर्मणां नेतारः अध्वर्य्वादयः

How strange it is that Sāyaṇa finds every man in this world as a sacrificer due to the wrong conception that the Vedas mean only rituals !

We have proved above beyond doubt that Yāska, Skanda, Durga, Ātmānanda, Jayatīrtha and other commentators clearly admitted that every verse in the Veda had three types of significance, i.e., pertaining to Soul (or the Supreme Soul), elements and *yajñas*. But the scope of Sāyaṇa is entirely limited and narrow as he miserably neglected two major aspects of the Vedic interpretation and only the Yājñika process has been imposed on every verse. We cite below a few instances from Sāyaṇa which will clearly show that the words Agni and Indra therein cannot mean sacrificial fire because of the qualifying adjectives which lead us to the conclusion that they imply some Omniscient Power :

(a) नृणां नृतमोऽसि । (*RV*. I.77.1)

(b) अग्निं विप्रम् । (*RV*. I.27.1)

(c) वह्निं द्विजन्मानम् । (*RV*. I.60.1)

(d) अग्निं पुरोहितम् । (*RV*. I.1.1)

(e) इन्द्रं विपश्चितम् । (*RV*. I.4.4)

(f) युवा कविरमितौजाः ।……इन्द्रः । (*RV*. I.11.4)

(g) उरुं हि राजा वरुणश्चकार । (*RV*. I.24.8)

(h) अग्ने………असि यज्ञेषु मानुषः । (*RV*. I.44.10)

MERITS OF SAYAṆA

Here we have pointed out some defects in Sāyaṇa's interpretation. But this is not all. The other side of the picture is yet to be painted. Let us imagine what the condition of the Vedic scholarship would have been today, had there not been the *Vedārthaprakāśa* of Sāyaṇa. This great interpreter of the Veda belonging to the 14th century has left no word unexplained, however obscure it may be. It would be better if we cite below a few words from Prof. M. Müller's preface to the *Vedic Hymns* :

> "It is well known to them who have followed my literary publications that I never entertained any exaggerated opinion as to the value of the traditional interpretation of the Veda, handed down in the theological schools of India and preserved to us in the great commentary of Sāyaṇa. More than twenty years ago, when it required more courage to speak out than now, I expressed my opinion on that subject in no ambiguous language and was blamed for it by some of them who now speak of

> Sāyaṇa as a mere drag, in the progress of Vedic scholarship. Even a drag, however, is sometimes more conducive to the safe advancement of learning than a whip : and those who recollect the history of Vedic scholarship during the last five and twenty years know best that with all its faults and weaknesses, Sāyaṇa's commentary was a *sine qua non* for a scholar-like study of *Ṛgveda.* I do not wonder that others who have more recently entered on that study are inclined to speak disparagingly of the scholastic interpretations of Sāyaṇa. They hardly know how much we all owe to his guidance in effecting our first entrance into this fortress of Vedic language and Vedic religion and how much even they, without being aware of it, are indebted to that Indian Eustathius. I do not withdraw an opinion which I expressed many years ago and for which I was much blamed at that time, that Sāyaṇa in many cases teaches us how the Veda ought not to be, rather than how it ought to be understood. But for all that, who does not know how much assistance may be derived from a first translation, even though it is imperfect ; nay, how often the very mistakes of our predecessors help us in finding the right track ? If now we can walk without Sāyaṇa[1] we ought to bear in mind that five and twenty years ago, we could not have made even our first steps, we could never at least have gained a firm footing without his leading strings. If, therefore, we can now see further than he could, let us not forget that we are standing on his shoulders."

This is all right. Sāyaṇa fills a gap in the history of the Vedic interpretation which otherwise would have remained unfilled. Pischel and Geldner assign a positive value to this great commentator. He often hints the right meaning of a word. For instance, the word *purīṣa* means 'water'. Roth, who believed that any European exegetist can understand and interpret the Veda better than an Indian—remarks that all Indian interpreters explain the word *purīṣa* as 'water', whereas the word actually means 'land'. But this statement is open to challenge. Undoubtedly Sāyaṇa, in a number of cases, paraphrases this word as *udaka*, i.e. water ; but in *RV*. X. 27.21 the word पुरीषात् (Abl , Sing., from *purīṣa*) has been translated as पूरकात् मण्डलात्. Here Sāyaṇa is still more forward than Roth. *Purīṣa* means 'orb, circle', and here it is used to denote

1. I doubt this very much even today.

the word मण्डल, 'a region, domain, land, earth', as opposed to the 'sea' or 'ocean'. Again in the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* (IV. 3.1) Sāyaṇa remarks : पुरीषशब्देन नद्याविगताः सिकता उच्यन्ते. Thus here we find that the meaning which Roth assigns to the word *purīṣa* was well known to the Indian scholar and was accounted for in a more reasonable way. While explaining the verse from the Nadī Sūkta of the *Ṛgveda*, Yāska (*N.* II.22) interprets the word *purīṣa* as पृणातेः or पूरयतेः, i.e., it is derived from the root *pṛ*, to protect or to complete. Yāska also takes it in the sense of water on the authority of the *Nighaṇṭu* (I. 12).

Sāyaṇa prefaces each hymn by specification of its seer or Ṛṣi : of the deity or deities to whom it is addressed ; of the rhythmical structure of the several stanzas and of the *viniyoga*, the application of the hymn, or of portion of it, to the religious rites at which they are to be repeated.

He mentions several schools and works but does not throw any light upon the exact sources of information which he employs in his works. Thus he refers to the following :

(a) Bhaṭṭabhāskara Miśra (b) Skandasvāmī
(c) Kapardisvāmī (d) The Nairuktas
(e) The Aitihāsikas (f) The Paurāṇikas
(g) The Śābdikas (h) The Sampradāyavidas
(i) The Ātmavidas (j) Bṛddhaśāsanam
(k) Pūrvabhāṣyakāras (l) Apare, etc.

MAHIDHARA

Mahīdhara was equally an important commentator on the *Yajurveda*; but from his Bhāṣya it is quite evident that he was a Vāma Mārgī and believed in the Tāntrika school of ritualists. It is useless to quote here a number of instances as the following one instance will convince the reader that something was seriously wrong with him. While explaining the Mantra (*YV.* XXIII.19) गणानांत्वा गणपतिँहवामहे, etc., he remarks :

अत्र गणपति शब्देन अश्वो वाजी ग्रहीतव्यः।

'Here the word Gaṇapati means a horse'. Then he adds : महिषी यजमानस्य पत्नी यज्ञशालायां पश्यतां सर्वेषामृत्विजामश्वसमीपे शेते । शयाना सत्याह हे अश्व······
······ क्षिपसि ।

"The wife of the sacrificer, in the presence of all the priests, lies with the horse nearby and then she addresses the horse and requests him......"

Thus Mahīdhara interprets this and the following nine verses in words which are not reproduceable even in the semi-obscurity of a learned European language. Here Mahīdhara deserves all censure for going too far to translate the word *gaṇapati* (i.e. Lord of multitudes) in the sense of a horse—which has no support in the entire Sanskrit language. For comparison I give below the English rendering of Dayānanda's Bhāṣya here :

> "We invoke Thee, O Lord and Protector of the numerous orders ; who art also the Lord of all that is dear and near to us—of all the treasures and precious objects (e.g. knowledge and wealth). Thou pervadest (this world)."

We feel, when we see that a very well-known and simple word, like *gaṇapati*, has been interpreted as 'horse', that Mahīdhara's mind was not free from ill-conceived pre-notions against Vedic teaching. Actuated by such grossly erroneous ideas, he wrote whatever he could. He ought to have read and consulted the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* in this connection before he proceeded to comment upon such Mantras.[1]

DAYĀNANDA AS THE INTERPRETER OF THE VEDAS

We have already discussed and critically examined all the interpreters of the Vedas, whose works have come down to us. All of them deserve praise for their scholarly Vedic exegesis. But Dayānanda, who was a great son of India, possessed spiritual insight, which enabled him to peep deeply into the Vedic lore. He was an inspired seer. He was a profound scholar whose equal India could not produce after the great Śaṅkara. It was left to him, once more, during modern times, to show the way to the world, regarding the method of the proper and correct understanding of the Vedas. Dayānanda, whose biographical detailed character we have

1. Cf. : प्रजापति: वै जमदग्नि: । सोऽश्वमेध: । क्षत्रं वा अश्व: ।
विड् इतरे पशव: । क्षत्रस्यैतत् रूपं यद् हिरण्यम् ।।
(*SB*. XIII.2.11) and (*SB*. XIV.15.16.17)
Also : राष्ट्रमश्वमेध: । (*SB*. XIII.2.11)
Again : ईश्वरो वा अश्व: । (*SB*. XIII.3.8.8)

dealt with in Appendix I (pp. 462-488), lived from 1824 to 1883 and devoted his whole life to the propagation of the Vedic knowledge.

Style

His translation of the Vedas is always preceded by a full analysis of each and every word, along with the grammatical and etymological explanation. Then follows the meaning of every word, then explanation of the whole, and finally the commentary and its general purport as he understood it.

All this was done in Sanskrit, which has been translated into Hindi in full, for him by the Paṇḍitas, employed for this purpose. It was one of the boldest acts of his life to have issued a translation of the Vedas in Hindi, the national language of India, since this translation had never been attempted before. This fact should be the best proof of the transparency and honesty of his motives.

Obscurity of the Veda

Before we go further to critically assess the value of Dayānanda's translation, it must be borne in mind that it was not a child's play to comprehend the Vedas in the real sense, much less to interpret them, at the time when no oral or written tradition could reach us from prehistoric days. In 1869 when Prof. M. Müller brought to light the first edition of his *Vedic Hymns* (*Part I*), he described his hard labour as one of "deciphering", and it is not a strange thing that he repeated the same feeling in the same words after more than 20 years, when he published the second and the revised edition of the same work. He remarked :

> "I hold that they (i.e. the first translators) ought to be called decipherers."

His adversaries ridiculed him on publishing a translation of the Vedas. According to them this work ought to have been attempted in the next century. Prof. M. Müller referring to his opponents (a whole host of German scholars) again remarked :

> "There is another point also on which I am quite willing to admit that my adversaries are right. 'No one who knows any thing about the Veda', they say, 'would think of attempting a

1. *SBE*, vol. XXXII, *Vedic Hymns*, pt. I, introduction, p. ix.

translation of it at present. A translation of the *Ṛgveda* is a task for the next century."[1]

At another place, he says :

"If by translation we mean a complete, satisfactory and final translation of the whole *Ṛgveda,* I should feel inclined to go even further than Prof. Von Roth. Not only shall we have to wait till the next century for such a work but I doubt whether we shall ever obtain it."[2]

Here M. Müller compares his own translation of the 165th hymn of the first Maṇḍala of the *Ṛgveda* with that of Professor Von Roth, and concludes that a comparison like this :

" . . . will disclose the unsettled state of Vedic scholarship, but the more fully this fact is acknowledged, the better. I believe, it will be for the progress of our studies. They (i.e. European interpretations of the Vedas) have suffered more than anything else from the baneful positivism which has done so much harm in hieroglyphic and cuneiform researches. That the same words and names should be interpreted differently from year to year is perfectly intelligible to every one who is familiar with the nature of the decipherments. What has seriously injured the credit of the studies is that the latest decipherments have always been represented as final and unchangeable .... When we come to really difficult passages, the Vedic hymns often require a far greater effort of divination than the hymns addressed to Egyptian or Babylonian deities.

The Veda, I feel convinced, will occupy scholars for centuries to come and maintain its position as the most ancient of books in the library of mankind."[3]

Baneful Positivism

Professor M. Müller undoubtedly voices the general feelings and a crying grievance when he complains of the "baneful positivism" of the European scholars as to interpretations which are little better than hypothetical conjuctures. The findings of the European scholars regarding

1. *SBE*, vol. XXXII, pt. I, introduction, p. xi,
2. Ibid., p. xxi.
3. Ibid., p. xxxi,

the Vedic civilisation and culture are based upon these interpretations where "the same words and names" are interpreted differently from year to year and thus they cannot be regarded as conclusive. Sometimes these scholars have given their verdict by judging these ancient civilisations by Christian or other modern standards. They at once forget that all standards are mutable and are modified and reformed before their own eyes.

We are undoubtedly grateful to these European scholars for the time and hard toil they have put in on Vedic research. Coming generations of India, who would devote themselves to the study and interpretation of the Vedas, would derive great inspiration from these researches which are so valuable and needed.

But we cannot help remarking that their hasty conclusions as to the worth of the Vedic religion and culture have done a great and unnecessary harm by creating a mass of prejudice against the Vedas in the minds of the Hindus. The Missionary propagandists made a good use of it and condemned the Vedas in the positive terms at their command. They quoted these translations and consequently educated Indians began to reject the Vedas and accepted Christian thoughts—though not (in some cases) Christian religion.

Dayānanda Stem in the Tide

Svāmī Dayānanda stood up and made up his mind to stem the powerful flow of anti-Vedic current by interpreting the Vedas in the style which he called *ārṣa* (i.e. the style of the seers).

A Christian Missionary writes about Dayānanda in the following words :

> "………He devoted himself entirely to the study of the Vedas from his 11th year and thus he is more practically conversant with them than most, if not all, of the great Pandits of Benaras, who generally know them only at second-hand or even less. At any rate, and this is the most remarkable feature distinguishing him from other Pandits, he is an independent student of the Vedas, and free from the trammels of traditional interpretation. The standard commentary of Sāyaṇa is held of little account by him. It can be no wonder, therefore, that his Vedic studies, conducted in that spirit, led him to the conviction that almost the whole of the (comparatively) modern Ḥinḍuism is

in entire and irreconcilable contradiction with the Vedas and the Hinduism of Vedic times, about 2,000 years ago. Being of an active character, he determined not to keep his conviction to himself, but to impart it to his countrymen and try to effect an entire reform of Hindu Society."[1]

Thus we see that Dayānanda was not an ordinary interpreter of the Vedas, like Sāyaṇa, etc., who have no definite aim and object and whose visions were narrow and dominated by the Paurāṇika influence and notions. His study of the Vedas was independent and was conducted in a spirit of the highest reverence too.

He was an inspired soul, who visualised the Vedas with the rational conception of the Ṛṣis who were depicted by Yāska as साक्षात्कृतधर्माणः, i.e., "to whom Dharma revealed itself." He saw the light and he refuted all anti-Vedic thoughts in the Hindu society and also criticised all the Vedic interpretations, which were based on Paurāṇika myths, quite unknown during the Vedic age. Sāyaṇa's commentary and all modern Vedic exegesis based on or influenced by Sāyaṇa, i.e., modern European translations of the Vedas, were severely criticised by him. He showed that the conclusions of modern scholars, envisaged in Sāyaṇa's commentary, were faulty and often effected by their conscious or unconscious Christian prejudice. In any case, in the words of modern scholars, e.g., M. Müller and Roth, all modern (Indian as well as European) translations of the Vedas are provisional. Svāmī Dayānanda did not know any of the European languages, not even English. His criticism of M. Müller, etc., in his commentaries is therefore based on information supplied to him by friends knowing English.

Peculiarities of Dayānanda's Translation

The following are the few aspects of Dayānanda's interpretation of the Vedas :

(1) The background of his Bhāṣya is the sincere conception that the Vedas are the words of God. Hence they contain pure and absolute knowledge.

(2) The words used in the classical Sanskrit, greatly differ, as regards their meaning, from the words used in the Vedic language. We

1. A. F. R. H., from *The Christian Intelligencer*, Calcutta, March, 1870, p. 70.

should not inerpret the Veda taking in view the current sense of the words in ordinary language.

(3) According to him, all Vedic words have derivative or etymological sense. The Vedas know no *rūḍhi* words (i.e. words with conventional sense). All words denote derivative and general sense. They are derived from the roots. Thus he does not take into consideration the worldly sense of the words. For instance, the word *ahi* generally means 'a serpent'; but in the Veda it signifies 'a cloud' (*vide* Yāska).

(4) Following in the footsteps of Yāska, he also believes that the Vedic words are used in the Vedas to denote triple significance of the Mantras, i.e., *ādhyātmika*, *ādhidaivika* and *ādhiyajñika*.

(5) The Pada texts of the Mantras have not always been adhered to. The Vedic sense is more important than the man-made Pada Pāṭhas. As we have shown above, Yāska himself has not adhered to the Pāda text. In the *Nirukta* (V. 21), Yāska divides the word मासकृत् (in *RV*. I. 105.18) in two ways : (i) मास+कृत् and (ii) मा+सकृत्. Yāska attaches importance to the sense and not to the grammatical formations, so does Dayānanda believe. Yāska says :

अर्थनित्यः परीक्षेत् । न संस्कारमाद्रियेत् । (*N.*)

Patañjali, the author of the *Mahabhāṣya*, also says :

न लक्षणेन पदकारा अनुवर्त्याः । पदकारैः नाम लक्षणमनुवर्त्यम् ॥

(*MB*. III.1.103)

(6) Dayānanda follows the school of the etymologists, i.e., the Nairuktas. Hence he does not believe that the Veda contains narratives or reference to historical personages. Undoubtedly all descriptions are symbolic and figurative as Yāska says :

तत्को वृत्रः ? मेघ इति नैरुक्ताः । त्वाष्ट्रोऽसुर इत्यैतिहासिकाः । अपां च ज्योतिषश्च मिश्रीभावकर्मणो वर्षकर्म जायते । तत्रोपमार्थेन युद्धवर्णा भवन्ति ॥

(*N*. II.16)

(7) According to Dayānanda, Devatā means the subject-matter of the Mantra, or a hymn. All words signifying a Devatā, e.g., Agni, Varuṇa and Indra, are the names of One Supreme Lord. There is only one Supreme Being described in the Vedas and Agnī, Vāyu, etc., are merely His different names indicating His most important attributes.

This matter is really set at rest by the well-known verse of the *Ṛgveda* :

इन्द्रं मित्रं वरुणमग्निमाहुरथो दिव्यः स सुपर्णो गरुत्मान् ।
एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः ॥

(*RV*. I.164.46)

[He is One, sages call Him by many names, e.g., Agni, Yama and Mātariśvan.]

This discovery, made again in the 19th century by Dayānanda, has, in India at any rate, brought about a revolution in the method of interpretation applied to the Vedas. This view is evidently based upon one important grammatical distinction. Dayānanda urged that the words used in the Vedas are employed in their etymological sense and undoubtedly this slight distinction in outlook has gone a great way in clearing up many difficulties and exonerating the Vedas from the charge of polytheism, and other theisms, invented and fastened upon them by the Western scholars.

(8) The *yajña* does not mean only a material sacrifice, i.e., to offer something into the fire. Dayānanda here is supported by the entire scripture of the Hindus where it is clearly stated that 'any noble and unselfish act' is called a *yajña*. The *Śatapatha* clearly says :

यज्ञो वै श्रेष्ठतमं कर्म । (*SB*. I.7.1.5)

The fourth chapter of the *Bhagavadgītā* describes all aspects of the *yajña* :

(a) एवं बहुविधा यज्ञा वितता ब्रह्मणो मुखे । (*Gītā*)

(b) श्रेयान् द्रव्यमयान् यज्ञान् ज्ञानयज्ञः परन्तप । (*Gītā*)

YAUGIKAVĀDA

Now let us examine the theory that the Vedas contain only *yaugika* words, as it is accepted by Dayānanda.

(a) Distinction between the Vedic and the *laukika* words is clearly indicated by the fact that Patañjali, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, makes two separate categories of these two types of words. He declares :

केषां शब्दानाम् ? लौकिकानां वैदिकानाम् च ।

Then he further remarks :

नैगमाश्च रूढिभवाश्च ।

Thus, he states in unambiguous terms that there are the Vedic words (which are *yaugika*) and the *rūḍhi* words (i.e. words used in the world to express conventional meaning).

Thus, Patañjali draws a line of demarcation between the Vedic and *laukika* words.

It becomes more lucid and clear when we compare the meaning of some words which are common in both the languages.

(i) According to *Nighaṇṭu* (III.15), the word *kaṇva* is a common noun being a synonym of *medhāvin* (i.e. the intelligent), while in the common language it is a proper noun, i.e., the name of a sage.

(ii) *Ahi* means a 'cloud' in the *Nirukta,* while it is a synonym of serpent in the common language.

(iii) According to the *Nighaṇṭu* (I.12) and the *Nirukta* (II.22), the word *purīṣa* in the Vedas means 'water', while it denotes 'human excreta' in ordinary Sanskrit.

(iv) *Kaṇva, vena, gṛtsa* and *uśik* are proper nouns in the common language , denoting some persons, while all these are synonyms of *medhāvin* (according to *Nighaṇṭu,* III. 15) in the Vedas.

(v) The word *Kuravaḥ* (plural of *kuru*) means 'doers', i.e. 'performing priests' (see *Nighaṇṭu,* III.18), while the same indicates persons or countries belonging to Kuru family in common Sanskrit.

Instances can be multiplied but paucity of space does not permit. This evidence clearly establishes the fact that it is not proper and reasonable to interpret Vedas on the basis of the classical Sanskrit. Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara could not understand this fact and hence they committed mistakes. Dayānanda's interpretation is an attempt in this direction.

Evidence of Yāska and Patañjali

The first canon of the interpretation of the Vedic terms, which is laid down by Yāska, the author of *Nirukta,* is that the Vedic terms are all *yaugika* (i.e. have derivative sense). They signify the meaning of the root together with the modification, affected by affixes. In fact, the structural elements out of which the word is compounded afford the whole and the only clue to the true signification of the words. The fourth section of the first chapter of the *Nirukta* opens with a discussion on this very subject, in which Yāska, Gārgya, Śākaṭāyana and all other grammarians and etymologists declare that the Vedic words are all *yaugika.* But Yāska and Śākaṭāyana maintain that *rūḍhi* terms are also *yaugika* in as much as

they were originally formed from the roots; but Gārgya holds that only the *rūḍhi* terms are not *yaugika* :

'नामान्याख्यातजानि' इति शाकटायनो नैरुक्तसमयश्च । 'न सर्वाणीति' गार्ग्यो वैयाकरणानां चैके । तद् यत्र स्वरसंस्कारौ समर्थौ प्रादेशिकेन गुणेनान्वितौ स्याताम् ।

This section concludes with a refutation of the opinion of Gārgya, establishing it as true that all terms, whether Vedic or *laukika*, are *yaugika.*

Patañjali also expresses the same opinion and distinguishes the Vedic terms from *rūḍhi* terms by the designation of Naigama (i.e. Vedic). He says :

नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते ।
व्याकरणे शकटस्य च तोकम् ॥

And a line before this :

नैगमरूढिभवं हि सुसाधु । नैगमाश्च रूढिभवाश्च ।

The sense of all this is that all the ancient Ṛṣis were of opinion that all the Vedic terms are derivative and denote general sense.

To an unprejudiced mind, the correctness of this law will never be doubtful. For, independently of the authority of the *Nirukta*, the very antiquity of the Vedas is a clear proof of its words being *yaugika.* Even Professor M. Müller is compelled to confess, at least concerning certain portions of the Vedas, that their words are *yaugika.* Says he :

> "But there is a charm in these primitive strains discoverable in no other class of poetry. Every word retains something of its radical meaning; every epithet tells; every thought in spite of the most intricate and abrupt expressions, is, if we once disentangle it, true, correct and complete."
>
> (*History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 553)

Further again he adds :

> "Names...............are to be found in the Vedas, as it were, in a still fluid state. They never appear as *appellatives*, nor yet as *proper* nouns ; they are organic, not yet broken or smoothed down." (*Ibid*, p. 755)

Can there be any thing clearer than this ? The terms occurring in the Vedas are *yaugika,* because "they never appear as appellatives, nor yet as proper names," and because "every word retains something of its radical meaning."

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Now let us examine the theory of Yaugikism in the light of the Vedic literature :

(i) **Vedas :** The internal evidence from the Vedas indicates that the Vedic words are *yaugika* :

(a) In *RV.* I.12.9 Agni is called as कवि, बृहस्पति and युवा. If we take the word *agni* as *rūḍhi* it means only 'fire' which cannot be a कवि, बृहस्पति and युवा. Hence we have to interpret these words etymologically.

(b) Similarly आदित्य has the epithets of कवि, etc., in *RV.* II. 28.1.

(c) In *RV.* I.48.4 the word कण्व has been used as an adjective by adding a suffix denoting superlative degree as कण्वतमः. In *RV* VII.79.3, the word इन्द्र is used as इन्द्रतमः ।

It is possible only if we take all words as derivatives denoting radical sense.

(d) Even the Vedic text contains etymological explanations of the words :

च्यवनमच्युतानाम् । (*RV.* VIII.96.4)

अश्नन्तावश्विनौ । (*RV.* VIII.5.31)

(e) In *RV.* I.164.46 Agni has been called as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa and Mātariśvā. How can it be possible if we do not accept these words denoting general sense ?

एकं सद् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः ।

(ii) **Brāhmaṇas** : We need not give evidence in detail from the Brāhmaṇas in this connection as they abound in etymological explanations. Every word has been explained therein by giving their radical sense :

(a) अश्विनाविमे हीदं सर्वमश्नुवाताम् । (*SB.* IV.1.5.16)

(b) अश्नुवाते हि तौ लोकान्
ज्योतिषा च रसेन च । (*BD.* VII.127)

(c) अश्विनौ यत् व्यश्नुवाते सर्वम् । रसेनान्यः ।
ज्योतिषान्यः । (*N.* XII.1)

(d) तद् यदक्षरत् तदक्षरम् । (SB. VI.1.3.6)

(e) Agni is explained in *SB.* VI.1.1.11.

Similarly see :

(*GP.* I.7) for Aṅgiras.

(*SB.* I.8.2.7) for Anuyāja.

(*JU.* I.20.4) for Antarikṣa.

(*ŚB.* XIV.6.11.2) for Indra.

(*SB.* X.1.1.5) for Graha.

(*SB.* XIV.5.5.18) for Puruṣa.

(*GB.* I.3) for Bhṛgu etc.

(iii) **Nirukta** : The *Nirukta* aims at giving all the possible etymological explanations of all words. Yāska has made it compulsory for the Nairuktas to offer every possible derivation :

न त्वेव न निर्ब्रूयात् । अर्थनित्यः परीक्षेत ।

न संस्कारमाद्रियेत् । (*N.* I)

Yāska goes as far as to say that even the *laukika* words are *yaugika.* Hence he explains them also :

इदमपीतरत् शिरः एतस्मात् एव । (*N.* IV.13)

(iv) **Mīmāṁsakas** : In the undermentioned citation from the Mīmāṁsā Bhāṣya we are directed to explain the Vedic words including those of *rūḍhis* in accordance with the grammar and the *Nirukta* :

(a) विद्यमानोऽप्यर्थः प्रमादालस्यादिभिः नोपलभ्यते । निगमनिरुक्तव्याकरणवशेन धातुतोऽर्थः कल्पयितव्यः । (*MDB.* I.2.41)

(b) शमयतीति शमिता । यौगिक एव शब्दः । (*MDB.* III.7.29)

Here we are told that the meanings are to be determined from the roots :

धातुतोऽर्थः कल्पयितव्यः ।

(v) **Skanda and Durga** : These two foremost commentators of Yāska in the following citations clearly tell us that the etymological explanations of words are highly essential to show that the words have comprehensive and unlimited scope of expression. If we accept only the conventional fixed sense, it will restrict their power of expression.

(a) Skanda says :

एवमेतत् सर्वनाम्नामाख्यातजत्वं प्रतिपादितं भवति । तत् किमर्थम् ? उच्यते—अर्थान्तरे यो रूढिशब्दः तस्यार्थान्तरे प्रयोगः .... । (p. 92)

(b) Durga also says :

स्वभावतो हि शब्दानां क्रियाजत्वेऽपि कांचिदेव क्रियामङ्गीकृत्यावस्थितिः भवति । (p. 64)

Durga also tells us that the various explanations given in the *Nirukta* do not indicate, as European scholars think now-a-days, that Yāska is uncertain about the definite meanings of the words as no tradition could reach him ; but these different meanings imply the unrestricted power of expression of the words. He says :

अनुपक्षीणशक्तयो हि विभवो वेदशब्दा यथा यज्ञपुरुषाणामर्थाभिधाने विपरिणममानाः सर्वतोमुखा अनेकार्थान् प्रकुर्वन्तीत्येतदनेन प्रदर्शितं भवति ।

(*N*. 1.20)

(vi) **Different meanings at different places** : Now we shall give below a brief list of words, which will show that one and the same word is interpreted by different scholars in different sense at different places. It is possible only if we admit that the Vedic words are not conventional but give radical sense based on the various original roots. This is the cause why Vedic words express different meanings and also why Yāska gave different significances of one and the same word :

(a) *Agni* : एष परमात्मा (Supreme Being) (Sāyaṇa, *AV*. II.1.4)
,, : A Brāhmaṇa (Sāyaṇa, *SB*. I.4.2.2)
,, : Lightning (Durga, p. 363)
,, : The Veda, Omniscient (Sandhyā Bhāṣya, pp. 14,55,60)
,, : Supreme Lord (Śrī Kaṇṭha, Śrī Bhāṣya, p. 3)
,, : Viśṇu, i.e. Omnipresent (Rāghavendra Yati, pp. 8,23)

(b) *Āpaḥ* : Does not mean 'water' but from the root *ap* 'to pervade' : Omnipresent (Skanda, *RV*. I.91.1)
,, : Supreme Soul (Sandhyā Bhāṣya, pp. 45,46,47,163,171)
,, : Cows (*SNB*. XII.1-3)
,, : Atmospherical region (Skanda, *RV*. I.52.12)
,, : Milk (Śatrughna, p. 184)

(c) *Indra* : Air (Durga, p. 710)

„ : Sūrya or Supreme Lord (Śatrughna, pp. 90, 133)

„ : God (Jayatīrtha, p. 22)

„ : Supreme Soul (Sāyaṇa, *RV* Bhāṣya, Bombay, vol. I, p. 52)

„ : Glorious group of Maruts (Skanda, *RV*. I.6.8)

„ : God (Sāyaṇa, *RV*. X.92.8)

„ : A rich trader (Sāyaṇa, *AV*. III.15.1)

(d) *Rātri* : Supreme soul (Sandhyā Bhāṣya, pp. 42,135)

(e) *Savitā* : Many meanings, e.g. Agni, Varuṇa, Vāyu, sacrifice, thunderbolt, sun, moon, mind, soul or a man (*Jaimini Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, p. 152)

„ : God (Sandhyā Bhāṣya, pp. 42,135)

„ : A sacrificer according to Śākapūṇi (Skanda, *RV*. I.34. 10 ; I.95.7)

We have a very long list of such words. The reproduction of the whole list will require a separate volume. The comparative study of this brief list of words will surely convince the unprejudiced reader to understand that the Vedic words are *yaugika* and thus possess a flexible character of expression.

(vii) **Aitihāsikas** : Sāyaṇa, Mahīdhara and other authors of the Veda Bhāṣyas, who interpreted in accordance with the Aitihāsika view by following the *rūḍhi* method, had to adopt in large number of cases the process of *yaugika* interpretation as there was no other way out. No obscure cases could be explained without resorting to the *yaugika* method.

Sāyaṇa interprets :

(a) *Aśvaḥ* : **व्यापनशील: आदित्य:** (i.e. the sun, and not a horse, as it conventionally means) (*RV*. I.164.2)

(b) *Ādityaḥ* : **परमेश्वर:** (i.e. God and not the sun) (*RV*. I.164.21)

(c) *Indraḥ* : **पर्जन्य:** (i.e. cloud and not the king of gods) (*RV*. I.164.33)

(d) *Bhrātā* : **परोपकारक:** (i.e. one who does good to others, and not a brother, as it ordinarily means) (*RV*. I.170.4)

(e) *Vasiṣṭhaḥ* : सर्वस्य वासयितृतमः (i.e. the abode of all, i.e. God, and not as a proper noun) (*RV.* II.9.1)

(f) *Rathaḥ* : यज्ञः (i.e. a sacrifice and not a car) (*RV.* II.18.1)

(g) *Manuḥ* : मनुष्यो यष्टा माननीयो राजा (i.e. a sacrificer or a king and not as a proper noun of a king) (*RV.* X.51.5)

(h) *Aṅgirastamā* : गन्तृतमा (i.e. the best of all who move and not as a proper noun) (*RV.* VII.79.3)

Thus we see that *yaugika* method is the only scientific way of interpreting the Vedas. The entire Vedic literature admits the superiority of this method. It has the support of Yāska, Patañjali and all the Brāhmaṇas. Skanda, Durga and all other ancient interpreters base their explanations on this method.

SUPERIORITY OF DAYĀNANDA'S BHĀṢYA

Swāmī Dayānanda employed the scientific method of interpretation based on the Nairukta school throughout his Vedic exegesis. It has many advantages. A few Indian scholars and all European scholars offer bitter criticism against the Vedic teaching. They are very easily removed through the medium of this interpretation. Agni, Varuṇa, Āditya, Mātariśvā and Indra may mean any thing in different contexts but they also mean Supreme Being (Brahma), described under different names. They are different names of one Lord. The discovery of this method, which was in vogue in Yāska's age, is quite new in modern times and it has brought about a new revolution in understanding the Vedic theme. In order that no doubt may be left concerning the monotheistic worship of the ancient Aryans, we quote from the *Nirukta* :

माहाभाग्याद्देवताया एक एव आत्मा बहुधा स्तूयते । एकस्यात्मनोऽन्ये देवाः प्रत्यङ्गानि भवन्ति । (*N.* VII.4)

[One Supreme Soul is variously praised, on account of His Omnipotence. Other Devatās are but *pratyaṅgas* (i.e., various manifestations) of this one Supreme Soul.]

From this, it is quite clear that Dayānanda's interpretation of the Vedas, based on etymological method, has a sound support in Yāska and the Brāhmaṇas.

It will be reasonable if a few citations from the Vedas themselves are given below in support of the theory that there was monotheism, i.e., worship of One Lord. It will clearly justify Dayananda's stand :

(a) एकं सद् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः ।

[He is One ; sages call Him by many names, e.g., Agni, Yama, Mātariśvā.] (*RV*. I.164.46)

(b) अग्ने भूरीणि तव जातवेदो देव स्वधावोऽमृतस्य नामा ।

[Many are Thy names O Agni, Immortal, God, Divine, Jātavedas.] (*RV*. III.20.3)

(c) इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते ।

[Indra moves multiform, in His wonderful creation.]
(*RV*. VI.47.18)

(d) तदेवाग्निस्तदादित्यस्तद् वायुस्तदु चन्द्रमाः ।
तदेव शुक्रं तद् ब्रह्म ता आपः स प्रजापतिः ॥

[Even He is Agni, He is Āditya, He is Vāyu, He is Candramas ; He is Sukra, He is Brahma, He is Āpa, He is Prajāpati.]
(*YV*. XXXII.1)

(e) सोऽर्यमा स वरुणः स रुद्रः स महादेवः ।
सोऽग्निः स उ सूर्यः स उ एव महायमः ।

[He is Aryamā, He is Varuṇa, He is Rudra, He is Mahādeva.]
(*AV*. XIII.4.4)

[He is Agni, He is Sūrya, He is verily Mahā Yama.]
(*AV*. XIII.4.5)

(f) न द्वितीयो न तृतीयश्चतुर्थो नाप्युच्यते ।
न पञ्चमो न षष्ठः सप्तमो नाप्युच्यते ।
नाष्टमो न नवमो दशमो नाप्युच्यते ।
... ... स एव एक एकवृद् एक एव ।
सर्वे अस्मिन् देवा एकवृतो भवन्ति ।

[Neither second, nor third, nor yet fourth, is He called. He is called neither fifth, nor sixth, nor yet seventh. He is called neither eighth, nor ninth, nor yet tenth. He is the Sole, the Absolute One, the One alone. In Him all gods become simple and One.]
(*AV*. XIII.4.14-21)

Nothing can be clearer than this. All these quotations will convince the reader that the ancient Aryans worshipped only one God. Thus Dayānanda's interpretation which establishes this fact before the scholars must be admitted as a very good attempt for understanding the purport of the Vedic teaching.

It will be well to quote here from an article by Aurobindo Ghosh on the interpretation of the Vedas by Dayānanda :

> "What is the main positive issue in this matter ? An interpretation of the Veda must stand or fall by its central conception of the Vedic religion and the amount of support given to it by the intrinsic evidence of the Veda itself. Here Dayānanda's view is quite clear ; its foundation inexpugnable. The Vedic Hymns are chanted to One Deity under many names, names which are used, and even designed, to express His qualities and powers. Was this conception of Dayānanda's arbitrary conceit, fetched out of his own too ingenious imagination ? Not at all ; it is the explicit statement of the Veda itself. 'One Existent, Sages, not the ignorant, mind you, but the Seers, men of direct knowledge, speak of in many ways, as Indra and Yama, as Mātariśvan, as Agni.' The Vedic Rishis ought surely to have known something about their religion, more, let us hope, than Roth or Max Müller ; and this is what they knew.
>
> "We are aware, how modern scholars twist away from the evidence. This Hymn, they say, was a later production, this loftier ideal, which it expresses with so clear a force rose up, somehow in the later Aryan mind or was borrowed by them from their Dravidian enemies. But throughout the Veda, we have confirmatory Hymns and expressions ; Agni or Indra or any other is expressly hymned as One with all other gods. Agni contains all other Divine Powers within himself, the Maruts are described as 'all the gods', one Deity is addressed by the names of others as well as His own, or most commonly He is given, as Lord and King of the Universe, attributes only appropriate to the Supreme Deity. Ah : but that cannot mean, ought not to mean, must not mean, the worship of the One. Let us invent a new word, call it 'Henotheism', and suppose that the Rishis did not really believe Indra or Agni to be the Supreme Deity, but treated any god and every god as such for the nonce, perhaps, that he might feel

the more flattered and lend a more gracious ear for so hyperbolic a compliment, but why should not the foundation of Vedic thought be natural monotheism rather than this newfangled monstrosity of henotheism ? Well, because primitive barbarians could not possibly have risen to such high conceptions and if you allow them to have so risen, you imperil our theory of evolutionary stages of human development, and you destroy our whole idea about the sense of the Vedic Hymns and their place in the history of mankind. Truth must hide herself, commonsense must disappear from the field, so that a theory may flourish : I ask, in this point, and it is the fundamental point, who deals most straightforwardly with the text, Dayānanda or the Western scholars ?

"But if this fundamental point of Dayānanda's is granted, if the character given by the Vedic Rishis themselves to their gods is admitted, we are bound, whenever the hymn speaks of Agni or another, to see behind that Name present always to the thought of the Rishi, the One Supreme Deity or else one of His Powers with its attendant qualities or workings. Immediately the whole character of the Veda is fixed in the sense, Dayānanda gave to it ; the merely ritual, mythological, polytheistic interpretation of Sāyaṇa collapses, the metrological and naturalistic European interpretation collapses. We have, instead, a real Scripture, one of the world's sacred books and the Divine word of a lofty and noble Religion.

"All the rest of Dayānanda's theory arises logically out of this fundamental conception. If the Names of the God-heads express qualities of the One God-head, and it is these which the Rishis adored, and towards which they directed their aspiration, then there must inevitably be in the Veda a large part of psychology of Divine Nature, psychology of the relations of man with God and a constant indication of the law governing man's God-ward conduct. Dayananda asserts the presence of such an ethical element ; he finds in the Veda, the law of life given by God to the human beings. And if the Vedic God-heads express the Powers of the Supreme Deity, who is the Creator, Ruler and Father of the Universe, then there must inevitably be in the Veda a large part of cosmology, the law of creation and of cosmos. Dayānanda asserts the presence of such a cosmic element ; he finds in the

Veda, the secrets of creation and the law of Nature by which Omniscient governs the world.

"Neither Western Scholarship, nor ritualistic learning has succeeded in eliminating the psychological and ethical value of the Hymns, but tbey have both tended in different degrees to minimise it. Western scholars minimise, because they feel uneasy, whenever ideas that are not primitive seem to insist on their presence in these primeval utterances; they do not hesitate openly to abandon in certain passages, interpretations which they adopt in others and which are admittedly necessitated by their own philological and critical reasoning; because, if admitted always, they would often involve in deep and subtle psychological conceptions which cannot have occurred to primitive minds ! Sāyaṇa minimises, because his theory of Vedic discipline was not ethical righteousness with a moral and spiritual result, but mechanical performance of ritual with a material reward. But in spite of these efforts of suppression, the lofty ideas of the Vedas will reveal themselves in strange contrast to its alleged burden of fantastic naturalism or dull ritualism. The Vedic God-heads are constantly hymned as Masters of Wisdom, Power, Purity; Purifiers, Healers of grief and evil; Destroyers of sin and falsehood; Warriors for the Truth; constantly the Rishis pray to them for healing and purification, to be made, seers of knowledge, possessors of the truth, to be upheld in the Divine Law, to be assisted and armed with strength, manhood and energy. Dayānanda has brought this idea of Divine right and truth, into the Veda : the Veda is as much, and more, a book of Divine Law as Hebrew Bible or Zoroastrian Avesta.

"The Cosmie element is not less conspicuous in the Veda. The Rishis speak always of the worlds, the firm laws that govern them, the Divine working in the cosmos. But Dayānanda goes further : he affirms that the truths of modern physical science are discoverable in the hymns. Here we have the sole point of fundamental principle about which there can be any justifiable misgivings. I confess my incompetence to advance any settled opinion in the matter. But this much needs to be said that his idea is increasingly supported by the recent trend of knowledge about the ancient world. The ancient civilization did possess secrets of science, some of which modern knowledge

has recovered, extended and made more rich and precise, but others are even now not recovered. There is then nothing fantastic in Dayānanda's idea that the Veda contains truths of science as well as truths of religion. I will even add my own conviction that Veda contains other truths of a Science the modern world does not at all possess, and in that case Dayānanda has rather understated than overstated the depth and range of the Vedic Wisdom.

"Objection has also been made to his philological and etymological method by which he arrived at his results, especially in his dealings with the names of the God-heads. But this objection, I feel certain, is an error due to our introduction of modern ideas about language into our study of this ancient tongue. We, moderns, use words as counters, without any memory or appreciation of their original sense : when we speak, we speak, we think of the object spoken of, not at all of the expressive word, which is to us a dead and brute thing, mere coin of verbal currency, with no value of its own. In early language the word was, on the contrary, a living thing with essential powers of signification ; its root-meanings were remembered because they were still in use ; its wealth of force was vividly present to the mind of the speaker. We say 'wolf' and think only of the animal ; and any other sound would have served our purpose as well, given the convention of its usage ; the ancient said "tearer" and had that significance present to them. We say *agni* and think of fire, the word is of no other use to us ; to the ancients, *agni* means other things besides, and only because one or more of its root-meanings was applied to the physical object fire. Our words are carefully limited to one or two senses ; theirs were capable of a great number, and it was quite easy for them, if they so chose to use a word like Agni, Varuṇa or Vāyu as sound-index of a great number of connected and complex ideas, a key word. It cannot be doubted that the Vedic Rishis did take advantage of this greater potentiality of their language, note their dealings with such words as *gau* and *chandra.* The *Nirukta* bears evidence to this capacity, and in the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads we find the memory of this free and symbolic use of words still subsisting.

"Certainly Dayānanda had not the advantage that a comparative study of language gives to the European scholars, but he stands

justified by the substance of Veda itself, by logic and reason, and by our growing knowledge of the past of mankind. The Veda does hymn "The One - Deity - Of - Many - Names - And-Powers"; it does celebrate the Divine Law and man's aspiration to fulfil it; it does purport to give us the law of cosmos.

"On the question of revelation, suffice it to say that here too, Dayānanda was perfectly logical and it is quite grotesque to charge him with insincerity, because he held to and proclaimed the doctrine. There are always three fundamental entities which we have to know if we would understand existence at all, God, Nature and the Soul. If, as Dayānanda held on strong enough grounds, the Veda reveals to us God, reveals to us the law of Nature, reveals to us the relations of the Soul to God and Nature, what is it but Revelation of Divine Truth? And if, as Dayānanda held, it reveals them to us with a perfect truth, flawlessly, he might well hold it for an infallible Scripture. The rest is a question of the method of revelation, of Divine dealings with our race, of man's psychology and possibilities. Modern thought, affirming Nature and Law, but denying God, denied also the possibility of revelation, but so also has it denied many things, which a more modern thought is very busy re-affirming; we cannot demand of a great mind that it shall make itself a slave to vulgarly received opinion or the transient dogmas; the very essence of its greatness is this that it looks beyond, that it sees deeper."

VALUE OF INTERPRETATION

Thus we see that the method of the Vedic interpretation, discovered by Dayānanda after hundreds of centuries and which had been in vogue (before the birth of Sāyaṇa, Skanda, etc.) during the time of Yāska, is a scientific one. It is based on the etymological and grammatical explanations of the hymns. He realised that the root-meanings of the words must be first sought and then applied, always keeping in view the context. Thus he was able to translate with the help of the ancient works, e.g., the *Nirukta*, the Brāhmaṇas, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and others, written by ancient sages. It is quite absurd, as we have already proved by quoting a number of evidences from the authentic works, to try to paraphrase the Vedic hymns according to the terminology of the Classical Sanskrit as some of the authors did. It is equally unreasonable to study the Veda under the light of the later Paurāṇika works. Sāyaṇa could not do without applying Paurāṇika influence over him.

HIS PLACE AMONG THE INTERPRETERS

Dayānanda did whatever he could and he deserves indeed our unstinted admiration. None can claim infallibility for his interpretation, nor did he. But "his honesty of purpose is clearly written on every page of his work," in that, unlike most of the European translators of the Veda (Max Müller and a few others excepted), he has not contented himself with giving his own empirical view of the text, but in almost every case has supported it with reasons and explanations and often by quotations from ancient authors, credited with a better and deeper knowledge of the Vedas, on account of the nearness of their time to the Vedic period of Indian civilization.

Speaking of his own efforts to understand and then translate the Vedas for the public, Prof. Max Müller says that it is a mere beginning, "a mere contribution towards the better understanding of the Vedic hymns," and he felt convinced that on many points his translation was liable to correction and to be replaced sooner or later by a more satisfactory one. He further remarks :

> "There are, as all Vedic scholars know, whole verses which as yet yield no sense whatever. There are words the meaning of which we can guess."
>
> (*SBE*, vol. XXXII, *Vedic Hymns*, part I, p. 32)

Thus all that we claim for Dayānanda's translation of the Vedas is that, from the Hindu point of view, it is the best and the most scholarly translation of that ancient Scripture, so far given to the public ; yet, that Dayānanda has only shown the way to the coming generation how to approach the Vedas, how to interpret them. It would take centuries of hard labour and tireless scholarship before anything like a complete and thoroughly satisfactory translation of the Vedas could be made. Generations of learned Aryans will have to devote their lives to the study of the Vedas in a spirit of reverent devotion and with a determination to master all their riddles and difficulties, before these ancient Scriptures yield up even a fraction of their treasures of beauty and truth.

We would like to conclude this discussion by quoting a few lines from Aurobindo Ghosh, whose impartiality and independence of view cannot be questioned and who has given full support to the line of interpretation adopted by the great sage Dayānanda, for the assessment of the value of his translation :

> "In the matter of Vedic interpretation, I am convinced that, whatever may be the final, complete interpretation, Dayānanda

will be honoured as the **first discoverer** of the right clues. Amidst chaos and obscurity of old ignorance and age-long misunderstanding, his was the eye of direct vision that pierced to the truth and fastened on that which was essential. He has found the keys of the doors that time had closed and rent asunder the seals of the imprisoned Fountain."*

---

* A strong support is given indirectly by some impartial European scholars to Dayānanda's interpretation of the Veda by admitting that the Vedas inculcate worship of one God.

(1) Ernest Wood writes :

"In the eyes of the Hindus, there is but one Supreme God. This was stated long ago in the Rig Veda in the following words, *Ekam sad-viprāḥ bahudhā vadanti*' which may be translated as 'The sages name The One Being variously.' "

(*An Englishman Defends Mother India*, p. 128)

(2) W.D. Brown, an English Scholar writes in his book, *Superiority of the Vedic Religion* :

"It (Vedic Religion) recognises but one God. It is a thoroughly scientific religion, where religion and science meet hand in hand. Here Theology is based upon Science and Philosophy."

(3) Jacolliat, a French savant, author of *The Bible in India,* wrote thus in his book about the Vedas :

"Astonishing fact ! The Hindu Revelation (i.e. Veda) is of all revelations the only one whose ideas are in perfect harmony with modern science."

Finally we can say that whatever view may be taken by the Vedic scholars who will appear in the field in later years, we have not the least doubt that they shall have to recognise and appreciate the method of the Vedic interpretation adopted by Dayānanda.

CHAPTER VIII

TRIBUTES FROM CONTEMPORARIES

The amount of obloquy and persecution, to which Dayānanda was exposed in his life-time, may be gathered from the fact that numerous attempts were made on his life by the orthodox Hindus and Muslims ; assassins were hired to kill him ; missiles were thrown at him during his lectures and disputations ; he was called a hired emissary of the Christians, an apostate, an atheist, and so on. The spirit in which he met this fierce opposition may be judged from the following anecdotes which we cull from Madame Blavatsky's account of him in her book, *The Caves and Jungles of Hindustan.*

"One is inclined to think", says Madame Blavatsky, "that this wonderful Hindu bears a charmed life, so careless is he of raising the worst human passions, which are so dangerous in India. At Benaras, a worshipper of the Shiva, feeling sure that his cobra, trained purposely for the mysteries of a Shivaite pagoda, would at once make an end of the offender's life, triumphantly exclaimed : 'Let this god Vāsuki (the snake god) himself show which of us is right !'

"Dayananda jerked off the cobra twisting round his leg, and with a single vigorous movement crushed his reptile's head. 'Let him do so', he quietly assented, 'your god has been too slow. It is I who have decided the dispute. Now go !' added he, addressing the crowd, 'and tell every one how easily perish all false gods'. Truly, a marble statue could not be less moved by the raging wrath of the crowd. We saw him once at work. He sent away all his faithful followers, and forbade them either to watch over him or to defend him, and stood alone before the infuriated crowd, facing calmly the monster, ready to spring upon him and tear him to pieces."

In the same work, Madame Blavatsky pays the following compliment to his learning and scholarship :

> "It is perfectly certain that India never saw a more learned Sanskrit scholar, a deeper metaphysician, a more wonderful

orator, and a more fearless denunciator of any evil, than Dayananda, since the time of Shankaracharya."[1]

Another testimony to his erudition, and we have finished our account of the Swāmī's life. This is an unwilling admission of his great powers by his opponents among the orthodox Hindus; we give it in the words of Professor Max Müller :

> "At a large convocation at Calcutta, about 300 Pandits from Gauḍa, Navadvipa, and Kashi discussed the orthodoxy of his opinions .... But, although the decision was adverse, the writer of the report adds : the mass of young Hindus are not Sanskrit scholars and it is no wonder that they should be won over by hundreds to Dayananda's views, enforced as they are by an oratorical power of the highest order and a determined will-force that breaks down all opposition."
>
> (*Biographical Essays*, pp. 179-80)

His death elicited the highest tributes from all classes of people—Indian and non-Indian, Hindus, Musalmans, Christians and Parsis. The greatest among his contemporaries wrote or spoke of him in the highest terms and deplored his early death : of those we may mention the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the greatest 19th century leader of the Muslims of India; Colonel Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, and Madame Blavatsky, its founder. But the most characteristic tribute came from Professor Max Müller, who compared him with Dr. Pursy, of England, and wrote remarkably eulogistic notice of the man and his work.[2]

> "Deply read in theological literature of his country.........he was opposed to many of the abuses that had crept in, as he well knew, during the later periods of the religious growth of India, and of which, and is now well known, no trace can be found in the ancient sacred texts of the Brāhmaṇas, the Vedas......... In his public disputations with the most learned Pandits at Benaras and elsewhere, he was generally supposed to have been victorious, though often the aid of the police had to be called in to protect him from the blows of his conquered foes."

---

1. The famous founder of the Vedantic school of Indian thought, who flourished around 800 A.D.

2. Max Müller, *Biographical Essays*, p. 167.

We give here, as a fitting conclusion to this chapter, a few passages from a long tribute which appeared in the official organ of the Theosophical Society, *The Theosophist* :

> "A master spirit has passed away from India, Pandit Dayananda Sarasvati ... ... is gone ; the irrepressible, energetic reformer, whose mighty voice and passionate eloquence for the last few years raised thousands of people in India from lethargic indifference and stupor into active patriotism, is no more ... ..."
>
> "*De Mortuis Nil Nisi Bonum.* All our differences have been burnt with the body......We remember only the grand virtues and noble qualities of our former colleague and teacher, and late antagonist. We bear in mind but his life-long devotion to the cause of Aryan regeneration ; his ardent love for the grand philosophy of his forefathers ; his relentless, untiring zeal in the work of the projected social and religious reform ; and it is with unfeigned sorrow that we now hasten to join the ranks of his many mourners. In him, India has lost one of her noblest sons. A patriot in the true sense of the word, Swāmī Dayānanda laboured from his earliest years for the recovery of the lost treasures of Indian intellect. His zeal for the reformation of his motherland was exceeded only by his unbounded learning. Whatever might be said as to his interpretations of the sacred writings, there can be but one opinion as to his knowledge of Sanskrit, and the impetus to the study of both received at his hands. There are a few towns and but one province, namely Madras, that Pandit Dayānanda did not visit in furtherance of his missionary work, and fewer still where he has not left the impress of his remarkable mind behind him. He threw, as it were, a bomb-shell in the midst of the stagnant masses of degenerated Hinduism, and fired with love for the teachings of the Rishis and Vedic learning the hearts of all who were drawn within the influence of his eloquent oratory. Certainly there was no better or no grander orator in Hindi and Sanskrit than Dayānanda, throughout the length and breadth of this land."

An soon as the sad rumour was confirmed, Colonel Olcott, who was then at Cawnpore, paid a public tribute to the Swāmī's memory. He said :

> "Whatever might have been rights or wrongs in the controversy, and whatever other Pandits or Orientalists could say against

the Swami, there was no room for two opinions as to his energetic patriotism or of the nationalising influence exerted upon his followers. In Pandit Dayānanda Sarasvatī, there was a total absence of anything like degrading sycophancy and toadyism towards foreigners from interested motives."

Again :

"Truly, however heretical and blasphemous might have appeared his religious radicalism in the sight of old orthodox Brahminism, still the teachings and Vedic doctrines promulgated by him were a thousand times more consonant with Shruti or even Smriti than the doctrines taught by all other native Samajas put together. If he merged the old idols into One Living Being, Ishwara, as being only the attributes and powers of the latter, he yet had never attempted the folly of forcing down the throats of his followers the hybrid *compound* of a Durga-Moses, Christ-and-Koran, and Buddha-Chaitanya mixture of the modern reformers. The Arya Samaj rites certainly make the nearest approach to the real Vedic national religion."

In the words of Romain Rolland (A.D. 1886-1944) :

"Indian religious thought raised a purely Indian Samaj against Keshab's Brahmo Samaj and against all attempt at westernization, even during his lifetime, and at its head was a personality of the highest order, Dayanand Saraswati (1824-1883).

"This man with the nature of a lion is one of those, whom Europe is too apt to forget when she judges India, but whom she will probably be forced to remember to her cost ; for he was that rare combination, a thinker of action with a genius for leadership.

"For fifteen years this son of a rich Brahmin, despoiled of everything and subsisting on alms, wandered as a Sadhu clad in the saffron robe along the roads of India. At length about 1860 he found at Muttra an old Guru even more implacable than himself in his condemnation of all weakness and his hatred of superstition, a "sannyasi" blind from infancy and from the age of eleven quite alone in the world, a learned man, a terrible man, Swami Virjanand Saraswati. Dayanand

put himself under his 'discipline', which in its old literal seventeenth century sense scarred his flesh as well as his spirit. Dayanand served this untamable and indomitable man for two and a half years as his pupil. It is therefore mere justice to remember that his subsequent course of action was simply the fulfilment of the will for the stern blind man. When they separated Virjanand extracted from him the promise that he would consecrate his life to the annihilation of the heresies that had crept into the Pauranic (old) faith to re-establish the ancient religious methods of the age before Buddha, and to disseminate the truth.

"Dayanand immediately began to preach in Northern India, but unlike the benign men of God who open all heaven before the eyes of their hearers he was a hero of the *Iliad* or of the *Gita* with the athletic strength of a Hercules, who thundered against all forms of thought other than his own, the only true one. He was so successful that in five years Northern India was completely changed. During these five years his life was attempted four or five times—sometimes by poison. Once a fanatic threw a cobra at his face in the name of Shiva, but he caught it and crushed it. It was impossible to get the better of him; for he possessed an unrivalled knowledge of Sanskrit and the Vedas, while the burning vehemence of his words brought his adversaries to naught. They likened him to a flood. Never since Sankara had such a prophet of Vedism appeared. The orthodox Brahmins, completely overwhelmed, appealed from him to Benares, their Rome. Dayanand went there fearlessly, and undertook in November, 1869, a Homeric contest. Before millions of assailants, all eager to bring him to his knees, he argued for hours together alone against three hundred pandits,—the whole front line and the reserve of Hindu orthodoxy. He proved that the Vedant as practised was diametrically opposed to the primitive Vedas. He claimed that he was going back to the true Word, the pure Law of two thousand years earlier. They had not the patience to hear him out. He was hooted down and excommunicated. A void was created round him, but the echo of such a combat in the style of the *Mahabharata* spread throughtout the country, so that his name became famous over the whole of India. Dayanand was not a man to come to an understanding with

religious philosophers imbued with Western ideas. His national Indian theism, its steel faith forged from the pure metal of the Vedas alone, had nothing in common with theirs, tinged as it was with modern doubt, which denied the infallibility of the Vedas and the doctrine of transmigration. Its (Arya Samaj's) spontaneous and impassioned success in contrast to the slight reverberations of Keshab's Brahmo Samaj, shows the degree to which Dayanand's stern teachings corresponded to the thought of his country and to the first stirrings of Indian nationalism, to which he contributed.

"The enthusiastic reception accorded to the thunderous champion of the Vedas, a Vedist belonging to a great race and penetrated with the sacred writings of ancient India and with her heroic spirit, is then easily explained. He alone hurled the defiance of India against her invaders. Dayanand declared war on Christianity and his heavy massive sword cleft it asunder with scant reference to the scope or exactitude of his blows.

"Dayanand had no greater regard for the Koran and the Puranas, and trampled underfoot the body of Brahmin orthodoxy. He had no pity for any of his fellow countrymen, past or present, who had contributed in any way to the thousand-year decadence of India, at one time the mistress of the world. He was a ruthless critic of all who, according to him, had falsified or profaned the true Vedic religion. He was a Luther fighting against his own misled and misguided Church of Rome ; and his first care was to throw open wells of the holy books, so that for the first time his people could come to them and drink for themselves. He wrote commentaries on the Vedas in the vernacular—it was in truth an epoch-making date for India, when a Brahmin not only acknowledged that all human beings have the right to know the Vedas, whose study had been previously prohibited by orthodox Brahmins, but insisted that their study and propaganda was the duty of every Arya.

"Dayanand transfused into the languid body of India his own formidable energy, his certainty, his lion's blood. His words rang with heroic power. He reminded the secular passivity of a people, too prone to bow to fate, that the soul is free

and that action is the generator of destiny. He set the example of a complete clearance of all the encumbering growth of privilege and prejudice by a series of hatchet blows. With regard to questions of fact he went further than the Brahmo Samaj, and even further than the Ramakrishna Mission ventures today.

"His creation, the Arya Samaj, postulates in principle equal justice for all men and all nations, together with equality of the sexes. It repudiates a hereditary caste-system, and only recognises professions or guilds, suitable to the complementary aptitudes of men in society ; religion was to have no part in these divisions, but only the service of the state, which assesses the tasks to be performed. The State alone, if it considers it for the good of the community, can raise or degrade a man from one caste to another by way of reward or punishment. Dayanand wished every man to have the opportunity to acquire as much knowledge as would enable him to raise himself in the social scale as high as he was able. Above all he would not tolerate the abominable injustice of the existence of untouchable, and nobody has been a more ardent champion of their outraged rights. They were admitted to the Arya Samaj on the basis of equality ; for the Aryas are not a caste. 'The Aryas are all men of superior principles ; and the Dasyus are they who lead a life of wickedness and sin'.

"Dayanand was no less generous and no less bold in his crusade to improve the condition of women, a deplorable one in India. He revolted against the abuses from which they suffered, recalling that in the heroic age they occupied in the home and in society a position at least equal to men. They ought to have equal education. according to him, and supreme control in marriage over household matters including the finances. Dayanand in fact claimed equal rights in marriage for men and women and though he regarded marriage as indissoluble, he admitted the marriage of widows.

"I have said enough about this rough Sannyasi with the soul of a leader, to show how great an uplifter of the peoples he

was in fact the most vigorous force of the immediate and present action in India at the moment of the rebirth and reawakening of the national consciousness. He was one of the most ardent prophets of reconstruction and of national organization. I feel that it was he who kept the Vigil."[1]

1. Romain Rolland, *Ramakrishna.* It is also cited in *Dayanand Commemoration Volume,* Ajmer 1933, p. 325 ff.

OM

ŚRĪ DAYĀNANDA SARASVATĪ'S

ṚGVEDĀDI-BHĀṢYA-BHŪMIKĀ

Om ! May (God) protect us both (preceptor and pupil or the author and the reader) simultaneously ; may He give us enjoyments ; may we attain strength together ; may our learning be luminous and dignified; may we never harm each other.

May there be peace (to all from external material objects) ; may there be peace (from our ownselves) ; may there be peace (from Divine Wrath). (*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, II. 1)

(1) Having made obeisance to Supreme Being (Brahman), who has no beginning or end, the creator of the universe, unborn, eternal, the highest reality and whose perpetual knowledge, called the Vedas (i.e. the Knowledge par excellence), upholds the Law (*nigama*) and destroys the unrighteousness and is blemishless, beneficial to the world and bestower of good fortunes on humanity, I, being desirous of explaining and interpreting the Vedas, compose this great commentary (*bhāṣya*).

ओ३म् । सह नाववतु सह नौ भुनक्तु सह वीर्यं करवावहै ।
तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु । मा विद्विषावहै ॥
ओ३म् । शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥
(तैत्तिरीयारण्यक, II. 1)

(1) ब्रह्मानन्तमनादि-विश्वकृदजं नित्यं परं शाश्वतम्,
विद्या यस्य सनातनी निगमभृद्-वैधर्म्य-विध्वंसिनी ।
वेदाख्या विमला हिता हि जगतो नृभ्यः सुभाग्यप्रदा,
तं नत्वा निगमार्थभाष्यमतिना भाष्यं तु तन्तन्यते ॥

The word भाष्य, from the root भाष् 'to speak' with ण्यत् means an exposition, gloss or commentary as in the word Veda-*Bhāṣya*, especially a commentary that explains *Sūtras* or aphorism, by words with comments of its own.

Cf. सूत्रार्थो वर्ण्यते यत्र पदैः सूत्रानुसारिभिः ।
स्वपदानि च वर्ण्यन्ते भाष्यं भाष्यविदो विदुः ॥ and

सुविस्तरतरा वाचो भाष्यभूता भवन्तु मे ॥
(*Śiśupālavadha*, II. 24)

(2) I commenced this great commentary on Sunday, the first day of the bright half of the lunar month of Bhādrapada in the year (Vikrama Era) 1933.

(3) Let the noble people (*lit.* sinless– अन्+अघ) know that this commentary has been composed by one, in whose name the word *Ānanda* (i.e. bliss) which is realised only by the self, shines after the word *Dayā* (i.e. compassion) and after this word *Sarasvatī* (i.e. learning) dwells (as if *Sarasvatī* lives) under divine shelter doing good to all. He is celebrated for his noble virtues and Vedic studies.

(4) By the grace of God, may I accomplish this Vedic commentary for the benefit of all men, giving the right and correct interpretation, based on rightly valid proof.

(5) I shall lucidly explain here the meaning of the Vedic stanzas in Sanskrit as well as in Prākṛta (i.e. the language of common people, ↔ Hindi) and this will satisfy all desires.

---

(2) कालरामाङ्कचन्द्रेऽब्दे भाद्रमासे सिते दले ।
प्रतिपद्यादित्यवारे भाष्यारम्भः कृतो मया ।।

According to the न्याय of अङ्कानां वामतो गतिः (i.e. figures are written from right to left) the phrase कालरामाङ्कचन्द्रेऽब्दे gives 1933. The words काल, राम, अङ्क and चन्द्र denote 3, 3, 9 and 1 respectively.

(3) दयाया आनन्दो विलसति परः स्वात्मविदितः,
सरस्वत्यस्याग्रे निवसति हिता हीशशरणा ।
इयं ख्यातिर्यस्य प्रततसुगुणा वेदमनना-
ऽस्त्येनेदं भाष्यं रचितमिति बोद्धव्यमनघाः ।।

It is very common with the Sanskrit writers that they give their names in this manner : cf. (a) "हिरण्यपूर्वं कशिपुं प्रचक्षते ।" (*Śiśupālavadha* I). (b) पुण्यः शब्दो मुनिरिति मुहुः केवलं राजपूर्वः (*Śakuntala*, II. 14).

Shri Ghasi Ram wrongly translates this verse : "Let the virtuous know that this work has been composed by one whose name (Dayānanda Saraswatī) is synonymous with noble qualities and Vedic study etc."

(4) मनुष्येभ्यो हितायैव सत्यार्थं सत्यमानतः ।
ईश्वरानुग्रहेणेदं वेद-भाष्यं विधीयते ।।

(5) संस्कृत-प्राकृताभ्यां यत् भाष्याभ्यामन्वितं शुभम् ।
मन्त्रार्थवर्णनं चात्र क्रियते कामधुङ् मया ।।

(6) I shall explain the *mantras* by following the ancient method of interpretation of the Āryan saints and seers (i.e. *Munis* and *Ṛṣis*) and not otherwise (i.e. the method which was followed by Sāyaṇa and others).

(7-8) This (commentary) will frustrate and foil all blemishes of modern commentaries and glosses, casting a slur upon and grossly misinterpreting the Vedas and will reveal the ancient and accurate meaning of the Vedic lore.

May this attempt (of mine) be successful by the grace of Lord.

---

(6) आर्याणां मुन्यृषीणां या व्याख्यारीतिः सनातनी ।
तां समाश्रित्य मन्त्रार्था विधास्यन्ते तु नान्यथा ॥

The distinction between a *muni* and a *ṛṣi* can be explained thus ; *Ṛṣi* is an inspired poet or sage or a singer of sacred hymns. They are the Seers of the Vedic hymns. Cf. ऋषयो मन्त्रद्रष्टारः and ऋषिर्दर्शनात् . According to Yāska, यस्य वाक्यं स ऋषिः i.e. they are the persons to whom the Vedic hymns were revealed i.e. Seers (e.g., कुत्स, वसिष्ठ, अत्रि, अगस्त्य etc.). *Muni* (मन इन उच्च, *Uṇādi*. 4.122) is a sage, a holy man, saint, devotee or an ascetic.

Cf. (a) मुनीनामप्यहं व्यासः । (*Gita*, X. 37)

(b) दुःखेष्वनुद्विग्नमनाः सुखेषु विगतस्पृहः ।
वीतरागभयक्रोध स्थितधीः मुनिरुच्यते ॥
(*Gita*, II. 56)

(7) येनाधुनिकभाष्यैः ये टीकाभिः वेददूषकाः ।
दोषाः सर्वे विनश्येयुः—अन्यथार्थ-विवर्णनाः ॥

(8) सत्यार्थश्च प्रकाश्येत वेदानां यः सनातनः ।
ईश्वरस्य सहायेन प्रयत्नोऽयं सुसिध्यताम् ॥

LORD'S PRAYER

(1) O Lord ! Creator (of this universe), ward off all ills and evils (from us) and bestow upon us only what is good (for us). (*YV*. XXX. 3)

Explanation

O God, Thou art all-existence, all-intelligence, and all-bliss, most merciful, possessed of infinite knowledge, bestower of knowledge and science (*Deva*) illuminer of the whole universe—the Sun etc., revealer of the knowledge, bestower of all joys, (*Savita*)—creator of the whole universe. Do Thou dispel far away our all miseries and all evil properties and surround us and graciously provide us with that happiness which is absolutely free from all pains and which through the attainment of real knowledge leads to prosperity in this life and to final beautitude in the next stage. Do Thou chase away all evil obstacles from this work of composing commentary on the Vedas, even before, they could occur.

O Supreme Brahman ! be compassionate unto us and bestow upon what is good, such as sound health (*lit.* body), discrimination, (willing) co-operation (of others), efficiency and the light of the true knowledge etc. May we (be able to) write, through Thy favour, this significantly correct commentary on Thy work—the Vedas, which may shine forth with radiance of true knowledge and also have the support of all proofs e.g., direct perception, &c. May this all, by Thy grace, be beneficial for the whole humanity. Be kind to ordain, O God, that people may hold this commentary in the highest faith and show the utmost regards for this. Om ! (*YV*. XXX. 3)

---

(1) विश्वानि देव सवितर्दुरितानि परासुव ।
यद् भद्रं तन्न आसुव ॥ (*YV*. XXX. 3)

Also occurs in *ṚV*. V. 82. 5.

The word *Savita* is derived from the root सू (to stimulate) with तृच्. It means stimulator, generator or creator. The *Nirukta* explains this word as सविता सर्वस्य प्रसविता (X. 31). According to the *Nirukta*, it also means the Sun आदित्योऽपि सवितोच्यते (X. 32). In nearly half of its occurrences, the name is accompained by *Deva* when it means "the stimulator or creator God." In one stanza (*ṚV*. III.62.10) he is besought to stimulate thoughts of worshippers who desire to think of the glory of the Creator. This is the celebrated, *Gayatrī mantra*, which is also called the *Guru mantra*. The Sun is also a great stimulator of life and motion in the world.

(2) Obeisance to God, the greatest and the most high, who governs the whole (universe and all times) past, present and future and who is the absolute bliss* (free from the slightest trace of pain). (*AV*. X. 23.4.1)

(3) We offer homage to God, the most excellent and the most high, whose feet are the earth, whose abdomen is the atmospherical region (*antarikṣa*) and who has formed the upper most region, illumined by solar rays (*divam*) as the head. (*AV*. X. 23.4.32)

(4) Deepest reverence to Lord, the most high and preeminent, whose eyes are the Sun and the Moon, renewed again and again and who has created fire as the mouth. (*AV*. X. 23.4.33)

---

(2) यो भूतं च भव्यं च सर्वं यश्चाधितिष्ठति ।
स्वर्यस्य च केवलं तस्मै ज्येष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥ (*AV*. X. 23.4.1)

(3) यस्य भूमिः प्रमान्तरिक्षमुतोदरम् ।
दिवं यश्चक्रे मूर्धानं तस्मै ज्येष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥ (*AV*. X. 23.4.32)

(4) यस्य सूर्यश्चक्षुः चन्द्रमाश्च पुनर्णवः ।
अग्निं यश्चक्र आस्यं तस्मै ज्येष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥ (*AV*. X. 23.4.33)

* The word स्वर् has been translated here as 'bliss'. According to the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Nirukta*, the following meanings can be ascribed to this word :

I. 'Heavenly region or the Sun' : साधारणान्युत्तराणि षट् दिवश्चादित्यस्य च (*Nirukta*, II.13) ; स्वः । पृश्निः । नाकः । गौः । विष्टप् । नभ इति षट् साधारणानि । (*Nighaṇṭu*, I.4); स्वरादित्यो भवति सु अरणः (*Nirukta*, II.14, IV.4).

II. 'Water'. It is given in the names of water. (See *Nighaṇṭu* I.12).

III. 'Heaven, paradise', as in स्वर्लोक. In classical literature it is very common "स्वरव्ययम्" etc. (*Amarakoṣa*).

IV. The sky, Ether.

V. 'The space above the Sun or between the Sun and the polar star."

VI. The third व्याहृति.

VII. Radiance or glow.

VIII. 'Bliss, free from the slightest trace of pain'

cf. यन्न दुःखेन संभिन्नं न च ग्रस्तमनन्तरम् ।
अभिलाषोपनीतं च तत् सुखं स्वः पदास्पदम् ॥

(5) Adorations to the Supreme Being, whose in-breathings and out-breathings are the air, whose eyes are illuminating rays (*aṅgirasas*)* and who has made the directions as the organ of hearing. (*AV*. X. 23.4.34)

Explanation

Our deepest homage to the highest and the greatest God, Who rules over the entire universe and also over the times past, present and future; i.e., Lord of all and is beyond the limitations of times ; Whose character is absolute and decayless joy ; where there is no slightest tinge of pain i.e., God full of surpreme bliss. (2)

---

(5) यस्य वातः प्राणापानौ चक्षुराङ्गिरसोऽभवन् ।
दिशो यश्चक्रे प्रज्ञानीस्तस्मै ज्येष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥
(*AV* X. 23. 4. 34)

* The word *Aṅgirasas* is derived from अङ्ग गतौ, (असि इरुट् *Uṇādi,* IV.235). According to the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* it is from 'अङ्गार'; "येऽङ्गारा आसन् तेऽङ्गिरसोऽभवन्". So the *Nirukta* (III.17) explains the word as 'अङ्गारेषु अङ्गिराः । अंगारा अंकना अञ्चनाः'. *Aṅgirasas* is also an epithet of Agni. Etymologically it is connected with Agni. For instance :

(a) यदङ्ग दाशुषे त्वमग्ने भद्रं करिष्यसि ।
तवेत्तत् सत्यमङ्गिरः ॥ (*ṚV*. I.1.6)

(b) त्वामाहुः सहसस्पुत्रमङ्गिरः । (*ṚV*. V. 11.6)

Thus it means firy rays or illuminating rays. In Vedic literature, we also come across adjectives like अंगिरसस्तमः (i.e., very rapid), especially like Agni, devouring everything.

Ralph T.H. Griffith translates these stanzas as follows :

2. "Worship to loftiest Brahma, Lord of what hath been and what shall be ;

   To him who rules the universe and heavenly light is all his own." (*AV*. X. 23.4.1).

3. "Be reverence paid to him, that highest Brahma, whose base is earth, his belly air, who made the sky to be his head." (*AV*. X 23.4.32).

4. Homage to highest Brahma, him whose eye is the Sun and the Moon who groweth young and new again, Him who made Agni for his mouth." (*AV* X. 23.4.33).

5. Homage to highest Brahma, Him whose two life-breathings were the wind ;

   The *Aṅgirasas* his sight ; Who made the regions be his means of sense. (*AV*. X. 23.4.34).

The earth is His feet (*pramā*), the cause of real knowledge, (i.e., people living on earth acquire knowledge). The space between the sun and the earth is His belly and Who has made the sky, illumined by solar rays, as His head. (3)

To Him—whose eyes are the sun and the moon, which renewed again and again in the beginning of creation and who has made fire as His mouth. (4).

The continuous adorations to the greatest Supreme Being of infinite knowledge whose two vital breathings (*prāṇa* and *apāṇa*) are the entire wind, whose eyes are the *aṅgirasas* i.e., the illuminating rays : (vide *Nirukta*, III. 17) and who formed the directions *diśaḥ* as the cause of all activities. (5).

(6) May we adore with oblations, the blissful Lord of creatures (*kasmai*)* the giver of spiritual knowledge, of power and prowess and Whose commandments all the learned people '*devāḥ*' acknowledge, Whose shelter is salvation and disregard of Whom is (misery and) death. (*YV*. XXV. 13)

---

* अङ्गिराः अङ्गाराः अङ्कनाः । (*Nirukta*, III. 17)

(6) य आत्मदा बलदा यस्य विश्व उपासते प्रशिषं यस्य देवाः ।
यस्य छायाऽमृतं यस्य मृत्युः कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम ॥
(*YV*. XXV. 13)

RV. X. 121.2 : The first part of the second line is difficult. Prof. M. Müller translates it thus : "Whose shadow is immortality, whose shadow is death." The meaning may be that His cold shadow (his displeasure or ignorance of him) is death while the shadow or knowledge of His bright glory makes His devotees immortal.

Griffith renders this verse :

> "Giver of vital breath, of power and vigour, he, whose commandment all the Gods acknowledge ;
> The Lord of death, whose shade is life immortal. What God shall we adore with our oblation ?"

The word (*kasmai*) may be interrogative pronoun, but Dayānanda, on the authority of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* says that it means प्रजापति or सुखस्वरूप. Cf. "प्रजापतिर्वै कः" (*Śatapatha*, VII. 3).

"*ka*" also means happiness or joy as in *nāka* which is explained thus : "न कं-सुखं=दुःखं ; न अकं यत्र." Yāska says "कमिति सुखनाम, तत्प्रतिषिद्धं प्रतिषिध्येत्" (*Nirukta*, II.14).

(7) May (there be) peace in the celestial region, may there be peace in the intermediate regions, may there be peace on the earth, may waters and herbs (bring) peace (to us) ; may trees be peaceful, may all learned people (*Viśvedevāḥ*) bring peace (to us) ; may the Vedic lore (propagate) peace (in the world) ; May all things be (source of) peace to us ; may peace bestow peace on all and may that peace come to me also. (*YV*. XXXVI. 17)

(8) From whatsoever region Thou desirest, make us fearless thence ; grant happiness to our off-springs (*prajā*)* and security, to our animals. (*YV*. XXXVI. 22)

---

(7) द्यौः शान्तिरन्तरिक्षꣳशान्तिः पृथिवी शान्तिरापः शान्तिरोषधयः शान्तिः । वनस्पतयः शान्तिर्विश्वेदेवाः शान्तिः ब्रह्म शान्तिः सर्वꣳशान्तिः शान्तिरेव शान्तिः सा मा शान्तिरेधि ।। (*YV*. XXXVI. 17)

Cf. : The nearly similar verse in *Atharvaveda* (XIX. 9.14) is also found which ends differently :

पृथिवी शान्तिरन्तरिक्षं शान्तिर्द्यौः शान्तिरापः शान्तिरोषधयः शान्तिर्वनस्पतयः शान्तिर्विश्वे मे देवाः शान्तिः सर्वे मे देवाः शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिभिः । ताभिः शान्तिभिः सर्वं शान्तिभिः शमयामोहं यदिह घोरं यदिह क्रूरं यदिह पापं तच्छान्तं तच्छिवं सर्वमेव शमस्तु नः ।।

Sāyaṇa and others translate the words *Viśve devāḥ* as 'all gods' But 'Dayānanda takes in the sense of 'the learned men' "विद्वांसो हि देवाः" (ŚB). This is derived from √दिवु क्रीडा-विजिगीषाव्यवहारद्युतिस्तुतिमोदमदस्वप्न-कान्तिगतिषु with अच् (P. III. 1.134) i.e., donor, imparter of joy or happiness, conqueror, illuminator. Yāska also states the same thing, "देवो दानाद्वा दीपनाद्वा द्योतनाद्वा द्युस्थानो भवतीति वा", (*Nirukta* VII.15). In the commentary, Durga adds "इह तु रश्मयो बहुवचनेनोच्यन्ते इति विशेषः" । (XII. 38).

(8) यतो यतः समीहसे ततो नो अभयं कुरु ।
शन्नः कुरु प्रजाभ्योऽभयं नः पशुभ्यः ।। (*YV*. XXXVI. 22)

Griffith renders it as follows :

> "From whatsoever trouble Thou desirest, give us safety thence. Give to our children happiness and to our beasts security."

From this translation, it is clear that the words "यतो यतः" give the sense of "from whatsoever trouble." But Dayānanda says "यतो यतो देशात् त्वं समीहसे जगद्रचनपालनार्थां चेष्टां करोषि" i.e., "from whatsoever region in which you desire to plant and maintain a world." The second interpretation is better. God, who is all merciful never desires trouble for his devotees.

(continued)

(9) Wherein, the *Ṛcas*, *Samans* and *Yajur*-verses, like spokes in the hub of a car, are inserted (*pratiṣṭhitāḥ*) and wherein all the knowledge of creatures is inwoven, may that mind of mine be moved by right resolve.

(*YV*., XXXIV. 5)

Explanation

(*ya ātmadā*) He, who is the giver of knowledge and wisdom ; (*baladā*) the bestower of nourishment, integrity, prowess and firmness upon the body, bodily organs, vital airs (*prāṇa*), the soul and the mind ; (*yasya*-) whom (*viśve devāḥ*) i.e. all the learned worship and whose commandments they acknowledge ; (*yasya chāyā*-) whose shelter (i.e. favour) is salvation and

---

According to Dayānanda प्रजाभ्य: and पशुभ्य: are in ablative case, i.e., May we have no fear from men and animals inhabiting any regions. But I preferred the dative case, i.e., give happiness to our off-springs and animals. Both the interpretations are correct.

The word *prajā* is from प्र+√जन् to be born or produced. It means (i) off-spring, progeny, issue, children, brood (of animals). Cf. : प्रजार्थव्रतकर्शिताङ्गम् (*Raghuvaṁśa*, II. 73), प्रजायै गृहमेधिनाम् (I. 7), प्रजाभ्य: पञ्चपदी भव । (*Pāraskara*) ; (ii) posterity, descendants ; (iii) a creature ; (iv) subjects, people, mankind. cf : ननन्दु: सप्रजा: प्रजा: and also प्रजा: प्रजा: स्वा इव तन्त्रयित्वा (*Śākuntalā*). प्रजानां विनयाधानात् रक्षणात् भरणात् अपि । स पिता पितरस्तासां केवलं जन्महेतव: (*Raghuvaṁśa*). See also *Manusmṛti*, I. 8 ; III. 42, and *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti*, I. 269.

(9) यस्मि॒न्नृच॒: साम॒ यजू॑ᳬषि॒ यस्मि॑न् प्रति॑ष्ठिता रथना॒भावि॑वा॒रा: ।
य॒स्मिँ॑श्चि॒त्तᳬसर्व॒मोतं॑ प्र॒जानां॒ तन्मे॒ मन॑: शि॒वस॑ङ्कल्पमस्तु ॥

(*YV*. XXXIV. 5)

Ṛcaḥ √ऋच् (स्तुतौ)+क्विप् (U. II. 57) ऋचन्ति=स्तुवन्ति यया सा i.e., by which we praise=*Ṛgveda*. *Pratiṣṭhitāḥ*—√प्रति+स्था+क्त (Paṇini, III. 2.102 and VII. 2.35=are estalished or included. *Arāḥ*—√ऋ to go+क (P. III. 1.135)=spokes.

Cittam—√चित् to know+क्त (P. III. 2.102)=Knowledge or thought.

Otam—"आ+√वेञ् (तन्तु सन्ताने)+क्त" (P. III. 2. 102) = strung, woven, sewn with thread across.

Śiva-saṅkalpaṃ—शिव: सङ्कल्पो यस्य तादृशम् (P. II. 2. 24.)=having righteous or auspicious intention.

whose disregard or want of protection is death, i.e., the cause of birth and death ; (*kasmai-*) for this KA i.e., lord of creatures, may we offer oblations. "*Prajāpati* is verily *ka*" (is stated in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, VII. 3).* May we constantly adore with offerings of love and devotion the Blissful Supreme God. (6)

(*Dyauḥ Śāntiḥ*) O Almighty Lord, may the shining firmament, the intermediate region, the earth, water, herbs, plants, *Viśve Devāḥ* i.e., all the learned, the Vedic Lore and the entire universe, through Thy favour and our devotion unto Thee be peaceful, safe and secure for ever. They may be favourable to us so that we may (be able to) write this Vedic commentary with ease.

O God, elevate us as well as the whole world, in every way, by this universal eleviation and afford us best help of knowledge, discrimination, wisdom and health. (7)

(*Yatoyataḥ*) O. God, make us fearless from all those regions, wherein it is Thy will to plant and maintain a world. In this way, may we have no fear, through your favour, from any quarter in any way. (*śan-naḥ kuru-*) Similarly may we get rid of all fears from men and animals living there. Grant us security from all regions, as well as from men and beasts inhabiting there and through your favour, accomplish us with the bliss of righteousness, riches, enjoyments and final liberations. (8)

(*Yasmin Ṛcaḥ*) O Glorious Lord, O Ocean of mercy ! the mind where *Ṛcas* (*Ṛgveda*), *Sāmans* (*Sāmaveda*) and *Yajur*-verses (*Yajurveda*) are firmly established and where real and true knowledge of salvation resides. (*yasmin cittam-*) In which men's knowledge (*cittam*)† in the from of memory is held in, like pearls by the thread. Where and like what (are they interwoven ?). Like spokes in the hub of a car they are held in. May that

---

* "प्रजापतिर्वै कः" (ŚP., VII. 3).

† The word *cittam* (meaning knowledge) has already been explained. According to the *Amara-koṣa* it means heart or mind. Cf. : **चित्तं तु चेतो हृदयं स्वान्तं हृन्मानसं मनः".**

But in the Vedic literature it has both the meanings, mind as well as knowledge. Yāska, explaining the Mantra "न नूनमस्ति" etc. (*ṚV* II. 10.1) says, "अन्यस्य चित्तमभिसञ्चारि । चित्तं चेततेः" i.e., mind of another person may waver. (*Nirukta*, I. 6). But the *Nighaṇṭu* reads it in the synonyms of *prajñā*. See *Nighaṇṭu* III. 9. Yāska (IX. 33. 1) also says : "चित्तानि = प्रज्ञानानि" Dayānanda takes the word *citta* here in the sense of "knowledge."

mind of mine, by your grace, be moved by noble resolve and adhere to only what is good and thus be enlightened with (light of) truth so that the accurate commentary of the Vedas may come into light. O Omniscient Lord ! you know all and everything. Be gracious to us so that we, without impediments, may be able to make this Vedic commentary correct and complete and to preach and propagate your glory and the true interpretation of the Vedas. Having gone through this, may all of us acquire all the noblest qualities. May you bestow upon us this favour. With this purpose (in view) I offer this prayer to you. Be gracious soon so that this all-beneficial attempts may be successfully accomplished. (9)

THE ORIGIN OF THE VEDAS

(1) "From that universally adored (*Sarva-hutaḥ*) and omnipresent (*Yajña=Viṣṇu*) God, *Ṛgveda* and *Sāmaveda* were born : from that (God), *Atharvaveda* was produced ; the *Yajurveda* was born from it." *YV*. XXXI.7

---

(1) तस्माद् यज्ञात् सर्वहुत ऋचः सामानि जज्ञिरे ।
छन्दांऽसि जज्ञिरे तस्मात् यजुस्तस्मात् अजायत ॥
(*YV*. XXXI. 7)

"*Yojña*". This word is translated by all Europeans as *'sacrifice'*. Prof. Macdonell renders this verse as below :

> "From that sacrifice, completely offered, were born the hymns and the chants ; the metres were born from it ; the sacrificial formula was born from it."

Griffith evidently could not accept this wrong rendering. He improved upon but could not find the right interpretation. I cite below his translation also :—

> "From that great General Sacrifice, *Ṛcas* and *Sāma* hymns were born ;
>
> Therefrom were spells and charms produced, the *Yājus* had its birth from it."

Sāyaṇa in his *Upodghāta* clearly says : "तस्मात् यज्ञात्=यजनीयात् ; सर्वहुतः=सर्वैः हूयमानात्" etc., i.e., "from that adorable and universally invoked God." Thus according to Sāyaṇa the word *yajña* here means *'adorable God'* and not "sacrifice" as it is interpreted by Europeans.

The word *yajña* is from the root यज् (देवपूजासङ्गतिकरणदानेषु) to sacrifice, to adore, honour or revere or to dedicate or give. Thus it has both the meanings, 'sacrifice' as well as 'adorable one'. If we take the context into consideration, the meaning of sacrifice has no justification here. Vedas were not born from any sacrifice. They were revealed by God for the accomplishment of *yajñas*.

Cf. "दुदोह यज्ञसिद्ध्यर्थम् ऋग्यजुः सामलक्षणम् ।" (*Manusmṛti*)

(contd.)

Sāyaṇa's interpretation of the word *yajña* is better and is based on etymology. Dayānanda goes a step further and cites the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* in order to support his etymological meaning. "यज्ञो वै विष्णुः" (*ŚB* I. 1.1.13) i.e., "*yajña* is verily Viṣṇu." Viṣṇu means Omni-present God "वेवेष्टि सर्वं = व्याप्नोति चराचरं जगत् स विष्णुः" i.e. Viṣṇu is so called as He pervades the whole universe.

Sarvahutaḥ=सर्व+ √हु(दानादनयोः आदाने चेत्येके)+क्त (P. III. 2.102) i.e., universally worshipped or adored.

"*Ṛcaḥ*" = √ऋच् to praise+क्विप् (U. II. 57). ऋचन्ति स्तुवन्ति यया सा (by which we praise). It denotes *Ṛgveda*.

Sāmāni= √षो(नाशे)+मनिन् (U. IV. 153). Yāska in the *Nirukta* explains it as follows : "साम सम्मितमृचा, अस्यतेर्वा, ऋचा समं मेने इति नैदानाः" (*Nirukta*, VII. 12). According to this, the following are the etymological meanings of the word *Sama* : (i) साम सम्मितमृचा i.e. *Sāma* is so called as it is mixed with *Ṛcas*. (ii) 'अस्यतेर्वा' √असु(क्षेपणे) to throw i.e., *Sāma* is thrown in the *Ṛcas*. 'प्रक्षिप्तमिव हि तत् ऋचि भवति' । (Durga). (iii) 'स्यतेर्वा' √षो (अन्त कर्मणि) As the *Sāmagāna* is a final item in a sacrifice. (iv) "ऋचा समं मेने इति नैदानाः". Yāska cites here the views of *Naidānas* who say that *Sāma* is equal to *Ṛcas*.

"*Chandānsi*"—Macdonell interprets it as "metres", i.e , metres were born from it. Griffith translates it as 'spells and charms' and adds, 'probably those of the later collections of the *Atharvaveda*'. But according to Dayānanda it refers to *Atharvaveda*. He says : "वेदानां गायत्र्यादिछन्दोन्वितत्वात् पुनश्छन्दांसि इति पदं चतुर्थस्याथर्ववेदस्योत्पत्तिं ज्ञापयति ।" i.e., The Vedas contain various metres—*Gāyatrī* &c but not withstanding this, the word *Chandānsi* (metres) is used to indicate that the *Atharvaveda* was revealed by God.

The word (*chandānsi* is derived from √चदि (आह्लादे) +असुन् (U. IV. 186,219). The worshipper rejoices in reciting the *chandānsi*. In the *Nighaṇṭu* (III. 4), it is explained छन्दत्यर्चतिकर्मेति i.e., by which we worship. Yāska says : "छन्दांसि छादनात्" (VII. 12).

"*Yajus*"— √यज्+उस् (U. II. 115). Yāska also says : "यजुर्यजतेः" (N. VII.12) i.e., from *yaj* to worship or adore. *Yajurveda*.

(2) "Tell me who is that Divine Being, from whom the *Ṛgveda* (*Ṛcas*) was produced (*lit.* 'hewed off'), from whom the *Yajurveda* was brought to light (*lit.* 'chipped'), whose hairs are *Sāma*-verses and His mouth the *Atharvāṅgiras*? (He is) *Skambha* (i.e. All sustaining God)." (*AV*. X. 7.20)

Explanation

(*Tasmāt yajñāt*) From that Supreme and Perfect Being (Para-Brahman), who possesses the attributes of Self-existence, Consciousness and Bliss (*sat, cit, ānanda*), who is Omnipotent and universally adored, were born the *Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda* and *Atharvaveda* (*Chandānsi*). That is to say that four Vedas were revealed by Him alone.

The word '*sarva-hutaḥ*' can also be taken as an adjective, (qualifying) the Vedas. Vedas are *sarva-hutaḥ*, as they also are worthy of acceptance by all*.

The two verbs '*jajñire* and *ajāyata*' (both meaning 'produced') are used to denote that the Vedas contain numerous sciences. Similarly the twice repeated pronoun "*tasmāt*" (from him) emphasises (the fact) that God alone is the revealer of the Vedas.

All the Vedas contain various metres—*Gāyatrī*- &c ; not withstanding this—the word "*Chandānsi*" (metres) denotes that the fourth Veda—the *Atharvaveda*—was also produced (by God).

According to the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (where it is stated that "verily Viṣṇu is *yajña*" (I. 1.2.13)† ; the word *yajña* means "Viṣṇu". Now Viṣṇu is God as the attribute of creating the whole universe can be applicable to God alone and none else. "Viṣṇu created this (visible and invisible) world, and He supports the threefold world." (*YV* V. 15)‡.

---

(2) यस्मादृचो अपातक्षन् यजुर्यस्मादपाकषन् ।
सामानि यस्य लोमान्यथर्वाङ्गिरसो मुखम् ॥
स्कम्भं तं ब्रूहि कतमः स्विदेव सः ॥ (*AV*. X. 7.20)

The word "*Skambha*" is derived from the root स्कम्भ् to create, to stop, impede or restrain or to stop. Thus it means = support, prop, stay, i.e., God, who supports all. All other words in this verse have already been explained.

* सर्वैः होतुमादातुं ग्रहीतुं योग्याः सन्तीत्यतः ।

† यज्ञो वै विष्णुः ॥ (ŚB I. 1.1.13)

‡ Yajur Veda :
इदं विष्णुर्विचक्रमे त्रेधा निदधे पदम् (YV V. 15).

He is called Viṣṇu as He pervades the mobile and immobile world.[1]

Explanation

"Tasmāt" Who is that Divine Being, the Almighty and the Supreme Brahman, by whom the *Ṛgveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda*, and *Atharvaveda* were brought to light ? Similarly (who is He ?) whose mouth—the foremost part—is the *Atharvaveda* ; hair—the *Sāmaveda* ; the heart—the *Yajurveda* and the life breath, the *Ṛgveda* ? In this way it is a figure of speach, called Metaphor. Tell me by Whom four Vedas were produced. It is a question. The answer to which is, "Be it known to you that He is *Skambha*—the all sustaining Lord."

Now this must be accepted that no other *Deva* than the all sustaining Lord is the author of the Vedas. The *Śatapatha* clearly states (XIV. 5.4.11) that "the *Ṛgveda*, the *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda* and *Atharvāṅgiras* are like the breath of that Greatest Being."*

Here *Yājñavalkya* says, "O Maitreyī, let it be known that the four Vedas—the *Ṛgveda* &c.—came out of God who transcends even space, like the breath easily and naturally." As breath goes out of the body and again goes into it ; so the Vedas are revealed and withdrawn again by God (at the time of creation and dissolution). (2)

Some one might object here, 'How could the Vedas, which are consisted of sounds (i.e. words) only be produced by God who possesses no bodily organs (*nir-avayava*) ? Here we say,' "This objection is untenable in connection with the Almighty." He always has the power of acting without (the help of) all such instruments as the mouth, the vital breath &c. Moreover, as at the time of reflection, we, in our mind, pronounce words and ask and answer questions (without using our external bodily organs) so we must believe that the same is true of God also. In his work, the Almighty never requires help of any body or any thing. True, that we do need aids and helps in our undertakings, but such is not the case with Lord. When the incorporeal (*lit*-limbless) God has created the entire cosoms (*lit*-world), what objection there can be raised to His having revealed the Vedas. God has created extremely surprising objects in this world, whose composition is as subtle and fine as that of the Vedas.

(The *pūrva-pakṣī* i.e., the objector may retort here saying that the similarity between the world and the Vedas is not true) because no one except God has the power to create the universe, but in the case of the composition

---

* Cf. एवं वा अरेऽस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतत् यद् ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्वाङ्गिरसः । (ŚP XIV. 5-4.11)

of the Vedas, men might have had the power to compose them just as they have power to write other books. Here our contention is that men have become able to compose books, only after studying the Vedas of Divine authorship and not otherwise. None can become learned without self-study (*paṭhana*) and receiving instructions (*śravaṇa*) from others. As now-a-days men acquire knowledge by reading some treatise (*śāstra*), receiving (*lit.* hearing) oral instructions and observing the (worldly) events. It can be explained by the following (example). Suppose a human child is kept in absolutely lonely place upto his death, being provided (of course) with food and drink etc., but never holding the slightest talk with him by means of speech As that child would not achieve the smallest knowledge worth the name, and as the wild human beings of the great forests behave like beasts until they receive instructions (*upadeśa*) from others, so all human-beings would have behaved (like beasts) from the commencement of the creation upto the present day, had not they received instructions through the Vedas. Not to speak of them, then their possessing of the power of composing books.

(The *pūrva-pakṣī* i.e., the objector again retorts and says that) this statement is not acceptable. God has granted men innate knowledge (*svābhāvika-jñānam*). This is superior to all bookish knowledge. Without this it is impossible to know the relation between the Vedic words and their imports. By developing that (innate knowledge) men would be able to write books. Hence, it is useless to believe in the Divine authorship of the Vedas.

At this point we ask : Has not God granted this innate knowledge to the child, who was brought in seclusion without providing any instruction as mentioned above or to the wild dweller of dense forest ? And how is it that we, too, do not become learned without receiving (proper) education and without studying the Vedas ? It is, therefore, concluded that mere innate knowledge is of no avail to a man without instruction and self-study. As men write books after acquiring multiform knowledge from the learned (teachers) and by studying the works of the learned, so all men, ultimately have to depend on Divine knowledge.

Moreover, in the beginning of the creation, there was no system of learning and teaching, nor there was any book (available to be read). Consequently none could possibly acquire knowledge (*vidyā-sambhava*) without receiving instructions from God. Hence, no man was able to write a book then. Men are not independent in the matter of empirical knowledge (*naimittika-jñāna*) and the mere innate knowledge is insufficient for the acquisition of knowledge (*vidyā-prāpti*) in general. What has been

said that innate knowledge is superior (to all and is self-sufficient) is absurd. As it falls in the category of instruments (*sādhana koṭi*) like the eye and as the eye is powerless to do anything without the co-operation of the mind, so innate knowledge is also too weak to acquire any thing without the help of the Divine knowledge and the learning of the learned men.

"What was God's motive in revealing the Vedas ?"

This question is to be answered by another counter-question. "What could be His motive in not revealing the Vedas ?"

"We do not know how to answer this (counter) question" will be (the plausible) reply from the objector.

"It is truly so. Now you listen what object God has in revealing the Vedas."

Q. "Is God's knowledge infinite or is it not so ?"

A. "It is so."

Q. "What is its advantage ?"

A. "It is for His own benefit (*svārtha*)."

Q. "Is not God, benevolent to others ?"

A. "He does good to others. But what of that ?"

This shows that the aim of knowledge is self-interest as well as of others. Had not God employed His knowledge for our instruction, it would have been futile in one respect. God has established the utility of His knowledge, by imparting it to us in the form of the Vedas. God, like a father, is the most merciful. As a father always cherishes compassion for his off-springs, so God, most mercifully revealed the Vedas for the benefit of entire mankind. Had he not done so, the eternal gross ignorance (*andha-paramparā*) would have been in vogue and thus men, being unable to accomplish righteousness (*dharma*), prosperity (*artha*), enjoyments (*kāma*) and salvation (*mokṣa*), would have (ultimately) been deprived of the Supreme Bliss. When God, most compassionately created bulbous roots, fruits and herbs etc. for the happiness of the created beings, why should He not have revealed (*lit.* imparted instruction) the Vedic knowledge, which embodies all sciences and bring to light all kinds of pleasures. The amount of happiness, which one feels in enjoying (*lit.* in acquiring-*prāptya*) all the best things of the universe cannot be compared with one thousandth part of the pleasure, which a learned man experiences. It is, therefore, definitely decided that the Vedic instructions (*Veda-upadeśa*) are divine.

Q. Whence did God procure the writing materials e.g. pen, inkpot etc. for scribing the books of the Vedas ?

A. Here our explanation is :—

It is surprisingly (*aha-haha*) a formidable (*lit.* great, *Mahatī*) objection, raised by you. As God created this universe without the assistance of bodily organs e.g. the hands, the feet etc. and also without the help of all instruments and materials, as wood, clay etc. so the Vedas were also revealed. You should raise no objection regarding the composition of the Vedas by Omnipotent God. But (remember) He did not reveal the Vedas in shape of books in the beginning (of the creation).

Q. In what form then ?

A. In the form of (the inspired) knowledge.

Q. In whose consciousness (were they revealed) ?

A. To the consciousness of Agni, Vāyu, Āditya and Aṅgirasa.

Q. But they (Agni, Vāyu, Āditya and Aṅgirasa i.e. Fire, Air, Sun and Light) are inanimate things, devoid of consciousness.

A. This is not so. In human bodies, they were human beings (born) in the beginning of creation.*

Q. How is it ?

A. No inanimate object can perform an act of intelligence. Where the primary meaning (of a word) is incompatible, it is the sphere of *lakṣaṇa* (i.e. Indication).† For instance, if a credible person were to tell another that the bed-steads were crying

---

* Sāyaṇa also corroborates, "जीवविशेषैरग्निवाय्वादित्यैः वेदानामुत्पादितत्वात्" (ऋग्-भाष्योपोद्घातः) ।

† Cf. : मुख्यार्थबाधे तद्-युक्तो ययान्योऽर्थः प्रतीयते ।
रूढेः प्रयोजनाद् वापि लक्षणा शक्तिरर्पिता ।।

(*Sāhityadarpaṇa*)

i.e. where the Expressed meaning of a word is incompatible with the context, we take secondary sense by *lakṣaṇā* i.e. Indication.

(मञ्चाः क्रोशन्ति), then it is inferred that persons sitting on the bed-steads are crying.* The similar method is also to be adopted

---

* There are three powers of words (शब्दशक्तित्रयी) to signify different meaning of all words, i.e. *Abhidhā*, *Lakṣaṇā* and *Vyañjanā*. *Abhidhā* is also called *Mukhyā-vṛtti* i.e. the Primary power ; which is defined as :--

"तत्र संकेतितार्थस्य बोधनादग्रिमाभिधा ॥" (*Sāhityadarpaṇa*. II)

Abhidhā or the Primary power conveys to the understanding the meaning which belongs to the word by convention (*saṅketa*). *Abhidhā* expresses the conventional meaning of a word. This *saṅketa* or convention is also fourfold as *Jāti*, *Guṇa*, *Dravya* and *Kriyā*.

The second power is called *Lakṣaṇā* or Indication. It is defined as :—

"मुख्यार्थबाधे तद् योगे ययान्योऽर्थः प्रतीयते ।
रूढेः प्रयोजनाद् वापि लक्षणाशक्तिरर्पिता ॥" (*Sāhityadarpaṇa* II)

When the primary meaning of a word is incompatible (with the rest of the sentence), this power of Indication is communicated (to the word) ; whereby another meaning (than the Expressed one) connected therewith becomes apprehended, either through usage—(*Rūḍhi*) or through some motive (*Prayojana*).

The sentence "कलिङ्गःसाहसिकः" is an example in *Rūḍhilakṣaṇā*. It means : "*Kaliṅga* i.e. (Orissa) is rash". But the quality of rashness is found in sentient beings only. Thus the primary meaning of the word *Kaliṅga* is inappropriate here. This is 'मुख्यार्थ बाध". Hence, the word *Kaliṅga* causes us to think of the men, residing in the country ; this meaning is connected with the primary meaning "country".

To take another example "गङ्गायां घोषः" or "herd-station on the Gaṅgā." The word Gaṅgā primarily signifies a "stream of water". But this meaning is inappropriate here as a herd-station cannot be built over a mass of water. Thus there is मुख्यार्थबाध. This incompatability leads us to think of the bank, which is connected with itself (*Gaṅgā*) by relation of proximity. Thus there is "*Tad-yoga*". **(Contd.)**

here.* The light of knowledge possibly shines in human beings alone. Here we cite the following authority (from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* in support of this) :—

(Contd. from page 19)

This power of a word by which we understand "men" from the word *Kaliṅga* and "Bank" from the word *Gaṅgā* is called "*Lakṣaṇā*'.

The first example is based on convention i.e. *Rūḍhi* and the second one on purpose i.e. *Prayojana.* This *Lakṣaṇā* has eighty varieties according to the Rhetoricians.

The third power of words is *Vyañjanā.* Its simple definition is as follows :—

"विरतास्वभिधाद्यासु ययार्थो बोध्यते परः ।
सा वृत्तिः व्यञ्जना नाम शब्दस्यार्थादिकस्य च ॥" (*Sāhityadarpaṇa*)

When Denotation (*Abhidhā*) and other powers cease after discharging their function, that function of a word or its sense etc. by which a further meaning is conveyed is what is called *Vyañjanā* i.e. Suggestion.

This *Vyañjanā* is twofold (1) that which is based upon a word's power of Denotation i.e. *Abhidhā-mūla* and (2) which is based upon its power of Indication (*Lakṣaṇā-mūlā*).

In *Lakṣaṇā-mūlā Vyañianā* we may take the example of "गङ्गायां घोषः" (i.e. a herd-station on the Gaṅga). Here the power of Denotation ceases after denoting the meaning of "a mass of water", and when the power of Indication ceases after conveying the meaning of the "bank", then that power by which the excess of coolness and purity is conveyed, is called "Suggestion or *Vyañjanā*" based upon "Indication".

We have explained here very concisely the three Powers of words. The interested reader may refer to the Kāvyaprakāśa or Sāhityadarpaṇa. This brief explanation given here will help the reader in understanding our text.

* This is to say that we should interpret here Agni, Vāyu, Ādityā and Āṅgiras as Proper Nouns denoting four seers, called by these four names. They were human beings. These words do not signify here inanimate objects of nature—Fire, Air, Sun and Light.

(3) From them, when they meditated, were produced the three Vedas: from Agni was produced the *Ṛgveda*, from Vāyu, the *Yajurveda*, and from Sūrya, the *Sāmaveda*.

God inspired their consciouness and the Vedas were revealed through them.

Q. This is really true. We infer (from your statement) that God gave them knowledge and they composed the Vedas with the help of this knowledge.

A. Do not take it in that sense. In what form did God give them knowledge ?

Q. In the form of the Vedas.

A. Was that knowledge divine or was it theirs own ?

Q. Surely it was God's.

A. Then, who did compose the Vedas ? God or they ?

Q. God composed them as they (the Vedas) are His own knowledge : (*lit.* they were composed by Him whose knowledge they are).

A. Then why have you raised objection and say that they (Agni and others) composed them ?

Q. To come to the definite conclusion.*

Q. Is God just or partial ?

A. He is just.

Q. Why, then, did He reveal the Vedas to the hearts of four persons only and why not to the hearts of all mankind ?

A. This does not indicate that God has even the slightest partiality. On the contrary, it clearly brings to light the exact justice of the

---

(3) "तेभ्यः तप्तेभ्यः त्रयो वेदा अजायन्त।
अग्नेः ऋग्वेदः वायोः यजुर्वेदः सूर्यात् सामवेदः।" (*ŚP.* XI. 5.2.3)

* These questions and answers are not really so. Here the objector and the demonstrator of truth are represented by the words question and answer i.e. the question stands for objector and the answer for demonstrator of truth.

Mark the convincing method of discussion. How remarkably has the author advanced arguments and the objector himself admits truth,

just God. Justice signifies to award fruit strictly in accordance with one's action. Be it known to you that only these (four sages) possessed previous (birth)—merits (*pūrva-puṇya*). Hence it was quite reasonable that the Vedas were revealed to their hearts only.

Q. But they were born in the beginning of the creation. Whence did they acquire these previous merits ?

A. Here we say that all worldly souls (*jīvas*) are without beginning in their nature. Their actions and this great effect i.e. the universe are too without beginning, like an eternal flow of stream. We shall establish their eternal nature by adducing proofs later on.*

Q. Has God composed (verses) in metres—such as Gāyatrī and others also ?

A. Why this doubt ? Does God lack in the knowledge of composing metres e.g. Gāyatrī and others ? He is Omniscient and knows this science as well as all others. Hence, this objection is baseless.

Q. Tradition (*Aitihya*) says that the four-faced Brahman composed the Vedas.

A. Do not say so. The *Aitihya* i.e. the Traditional testimony is included in "Oral Evidence" i.e. (*Śabda-pramāṇa*). Ācārya

---

* Here text is not very clear. "**सर्वे जीवाः स्वरूपतोऽनादयः। तेषां कर्माणि सर्वं कार्यं जगच्च प्रवाहेण एव अनादीनि सन्ति**" and the Hindi version given by Panditas is contrary to the Sanskrit text.

We have technically followed the Sanskrit text in our English rendering. But the underlying idea is still obscure. In order to make it more lucid we offer the following explanation :—

"*Jīvas*, their actions and this great effect (*kāryarūpa*) i.e. (*jagat*), these three things are *Anādi*. But this *Anāditva* has some distinct aspects. Souls and Nature (i.e. *Jīvas* and *Mūla-prakṛti*) are without beginning (*anādi*), in their nature. They are eternal. But the actions and this universe (which is an effect of *Mūla-prakṛti* i.e. the Original Nature) are also called eternal in the sence that they are like the members of a series which has no beginning and which flows on continuously like an eternal current of a river. Technically this eternal aspect is called as **प्रवाहेण अनादि**. *Ātmā* and *Mūlaprakṛti* are eternal by nature.

Gautama in his treatise on logic (*Nyāya-Śastra*) defines it as (4) "A statement of a credible person" and adds that (5) "Traditional testimony is also an oral evidence." In his commentary on this aphorism (*Sūtra*), Vātsyāyana, the commentator says, (6) "Āpta (a credible man) is he who has realised the truth and who being desirous of instructing others, represents the facts to them as personally visulised by him. *Āpti* means realisation of truth (about a thing) and '*Āpta*' is a person who possesses this."

Consequently, the truthful tradition only is accepted as "*Aitihya*", (i.e. a Traditional evidence) and not a false (or ambiguous) statement. Hence, that *Aitịhya* (Testimony of Tradition) is acceptable which stands the test of truth (*Satya-pramāṇa*) and is a statement of a credible person and not that which is contrary (to truth). A false (tradition), like the ravings of a mad man is (not acceptable). Similarly (the tradition) that Vyāsa or other sages (Ṛṣis) composed the Vedas is also false. The modern (*Navīna*)* books of the Purāṇas or the Tantras (which contain such false tales) are of no avail and worth.

Q. Why should not we accept that the Mantras (Vedic stanzas) and Sūktas (the Vedic hymns) were composed by those Ṛṣis, whose names are mentioned over them ?

A. Do not say so. Even Brahman and others have studied and learnt the Vedas from others. The Śvetāśvatara and other Upaniṣads contain passages (saying) :—

---

(4) "आप्तोपदेशः शब्दः" (*Nyāya*. I. 1.7)

(5) "शब्द ऐतिह्यमित्यादि" (*Nyāya*. II. 2.2)

(6) "आप्तः खलु साक्षात्कृतधर्मा यथादृष्टस्यार्थस्य चिख्यापयिषया प्रयुक्त उपदेष्टा। साक्षात्करणमर्थस्याप्तिः, तया प्रवर्त्तते इत्याप्तः।" (*Nyāya-bhāṣya*. I. 1.7)

* According to Dayānanda, there are two types of the Purāṇas ; (I) *Navīna* and (II) *Prācīna*. The modern eighteen Purāṇas e. g. *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* and *Agni Purāṇa*, contain false stories. They are included in the first category of *Navīna Purāṇas*. The second category of ancient Purāṇas includes *Śatpatha-brāhmaṇa* &c. The evidence of these ancient Purāṇas, is acceptable.

(7) "He who creates Brahman (i.e. ब्रह्मा) first and then verily sends forth the Vedas to him." (*SV*. VI. 18)

The Vedas were known to Brahman and others when Ṛṣis (Marīci and others) were not born. Manu says :

(8) "He (God) milked (i.e. caused them to be revealed) from Agni, Vāyu, and Ravi, the three (fold) eternal Veda (*Brahma*) by name Ṛg, Yajur and Sāma for the accomplishment of sacrifices (*Yajñas*)." (Manu I.23)

Again :—

(9) "Kavi, the son of Aṅgiras taught his fathers (*pitṝn*, i.e. elders)." (*Manu* II. 151)

When Brahman himself learnt the Vedas from Agni and others, (then) what have we to say about Vyāsa etc. ?

Q. Why are the Ṛgveda and other Saṁhitās ascribed two names *viz*. Veda and Śruti ?

A. Because each of these names denotes distinct significance. The word Veda is derived from the (four) roots, i.e. "*Vida*" to know, "*Vida*" to exist, "*Vidḷ*" to obtain, and "*Vida*" to think, by adding a suffix घञ् (i.e. अ) in the sense of Instrumental and Locative cases, in accordance with the aphorism :

(10) "*Halaśca*". (P. III. 3. 121)

---

(7) "यो वै ब्रह्माणं विदधाति पूर्वम् ।
यो वै वेदांश्च प्रहिणोति तस्मै ॥" (*SV*. VI. 18)

Here the verb *prahiṇoti* (प्र+√हि V.P.) ordinarily means (1) to send forth, propel, (2) to throw, discharge, shoot. Cf: विनाशात् तस्य वृक्षस्य रक्षस्तस्मै महोपलं प्रजिघाय । (*RV*. XV. 21)

In this passage it means "to give" or "to send forth".

(8) "अग्निवायुरविभ्यस्तु त्रयं ब्रह्म सनातनम् ।
दुदोह यज्ञ-सिद्ध्यर्थमृग्यजुःसामलक्षणम् ॥" (*MS*. I. 23)

(9) "अध्यापयामास पितॄन् शिशुराङ्गिरसः कविः ।" (*MS*. II. 151)

(10) "हलश्च" (*P*. III. 3. 121) On this aphorism Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita writes :—

"हलन्तात् घञ् स्यात् । घापवादः । रमन्ते योगिनोऽस्मिन् इति रामः । अपमृज्यतेऽनेन व्याध्यादिरित्यपामार्गः ॥" (Contd.)

Similarly the word *Śruti* is formed from the root √*śru* (to hear) with suffix क्तिन् (ति) in the (sense of) Instrumental case. The Vedas are so called as all men know all true sciences in or through them or as all true

---

(Contd. from page 24)

Here the author gives two examples, *Rāma* and *Apāmārga* in Locative and Instrumental cases respectively. Similarly our author explains the word Veda from four different roots in the sense of these two nonn-relations i.e. Locative and Instrumental.

i.e. According to Dayānanda the word "Veda" is derived from the following four roots :—

(a) विद् ज्ञाने (अदादिगणे परस्मैपदे, सेट्) यथा-वेत्ति ।

(b) विद् सत्तायाम् (दिवादि आत्मनेपदेऽनिट्) यथा-विद्यते ।

(c) विद् विचारणे (रुधादिगणे आत्मनेपदेऽनिट्) यथा-विन्ते ।

(d) विद्लृ लाभे (तुदादि गणे उभयपदीय: सेट् धातु:) यथा-विन्दति, विन्दते ।

But there is another (fifth) root in *Dhātupāṭha* from which we can get the word Veda. The root "√विद् चेतनाख्याननिवासेषु" is mentioned in Tenth Conjugation as *Set* in *Ātmanepada*.

This root means :—to make known, communicate, inform, apprise, tell or teach, expound as it is in the verse :—

"वेदार्थं स्वानवेदयत्" (सिद्धान्त-कौमुदी)

The following verse illustrates the root in some of its conjugations :—

"वेत्ति सर्वाणि शास्त्राणि गर्वस्तस्य न विद्यते ।
वित्त धर्मं सदा सद्भि: तेषु पूजां च विन्दति ।।"

cf. also :—

"सत्तायां-विद्यते, ज्ञाने-वेत्ति, विन्ते-विचारणे ।
विन्दते विन्दति-प्राप्तौ, श्यन् लुक् श्नम्शेष्विदं क्रमात् ।।"

This stanza also describes different *Vikaraṇas* in different roots.

(cf : Latin — v i d c o ; A.S. Witan ;
Goth — v a i t ; English—wit)

Prof. A.A. Mecdonell's Vedic Grammer is very poor in this respect. He gives only two roots instead of five. (√*vid*—to know and √*vid* to obtain).

sciences exist in them or as men become learned by studying them.* (The Vedas are also called) *Śrutis* as from the beginning of creation upto this day, Brahman and others have learnt all true sciences through them (by oral transmission)ϕ. No one (in this world) has seen the Vedas being composed

---

* "विन्दन्ति-जानन्ति, विद्यन्ते-भवन्ति, विन्दन्ति विन्दन्ते-लभन्ते, विन्दते-विचारयन्ति सर्वे मनुष्याः सर्वाः सत्यविद्याः यैः येषु वा तथा विद्वांसः भवन्ति च ते वेदाः ॥"

ϕ "सर्वाः सत्यविद्याः श्रूयन्ते अनया सा श्रुतिः ॥"

The word Veda has been used in ancient literature with two different accentuations i.e. "*ādi-udātta*" and "*anta-udātta*". The "*ādi-udātta*" "Veda" word (in Nominative, Singular) has been used in the Ṛgveda 15 times as "वेदः" (*ṚV*. I. 73.5 ; III, 53.14. etc.) and once in Instrumental case as in "वेदेन=स्वाध्यायेन इति वेङ्कटमाधवः । वेदेन=वेदाध्ययनेन ब्रह्मयज्ञेन इति सायणः" (*ṚV*. VIII. 19.5.) : in *Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda* we come across its use with *anta-udātta* which is not found in the Ṛgveda ; as "वेदः" (*YV* II. 21 ; *AV*. VII. 28.1).

Pāṇini enumerates this word in two different *Gaṇas* i.e. in उञ्छादि (VI. 1.160) and in वृषादि (VI. 1. 203).

It is intesting to note that this word is etymologically explained in the following Vedic Texts :—

(a) "वेदेन वै देवा असुराणां वित्तं वेद्यमविन्दत । तद्वेदस्य वेदत्वम् ।" (*TS*. 1.4.20)

(b) "वेदिः देवेभ्यो निलायत । तां वेदेनान्वविन्दन् । वेदेन वेदिं विविदुः पृथिवीम् ।" (*TB*. III. 3.9.69)

These uses are from the root √*Vid* (to obtain).

Bhaṭṭabhāskara in his commentary on *TS* explains as follows :—

"विद्यते-लभ्यतेऽनेनेति करणे घञ् । उञ्छादित्वात् अन्तोदात्तम् ।"

(c) Ānandatīrtha in his Viśṇutattvanirṇaya cites a stanza showing the derivation of this word :—

"नेन्द्रियाणि नानुमानं, वेदा हि एव एनं वेदयन्ति । तस्मादाहुः वेदा इति पिप्पलादश्रुतिः ।"

(d) In *Āyurveda* :—

"आयुरस्मिन् विद्यतेऽनेन वा आयुर्विन्दति-इत्यायुर्वेदः ।" (*SST*. I. 14)

(Contd.)

by any body in his corporeal body. Because they were revealed by God Who has no bodily organs. Agni, Vāyu, Āditya and Aṅgirasa are His instruments for revealing the Vedas of Divine authorship. This must be clearly known to you. The relation between the Vedic words and their objects is also divine as He is the Home of all sciences.

It has, therefore, been proved that the Vedas or Śrutis were revealed by God through Agni, Vāyu, Ravi and Aṅgirasa, who were men in corporeal form.

(Contd. from page 26)

Here the author appears to have accepted the suffix used in Instrumental or Locative senses.

The Commentator Ulhana derives it from the roots √Vid (to exist), √*Vida* (to know), √*Vida* (to think) and √*Vid* (to obtain) as :—
"आयुरस्मिन् आयुर्वेदे विद्यते=अस्ति, विद्यते=ज्ञायतेऽनेनेति, विद्यते-विचार्यतेऽनेन वा··· । आयुरनेन विन्दति=प्राप्नोति इत्यायुर्वेदः ॥"

(e) "तत्रायुर्वेदयति इत्यायुर्वेदः ।" (*Caraka* XXX. 20)

(f) Abhinavagupta in his Nāṭyaśāstra :—

"नाट्यस्य वेदनं सत्ता लाभो विचारश्च यत्र ।
तन्नाट्यस्य वेद शब्देनोच्यते ॥" (I. 1)

(g) Medhātithi in his commentary on Manu :—

"विन्दत्यनन्यप्रमाणवेद्यं धर्मलक्षणमर्थमस्मादिति वेदः ।"

(h) Kapādisvāmī writes :—

"निःश्रेयसकराणि कर्माणि आवेदयन्ति वेदाः ।" (*APB.* I. 33)

Svāmī Hari Prasāda's view that the word Veda cannot be derived from the above noted four roots is wrong. The above noted citations clearly prove the derivations of this word from these four (or five) roots.

THE DATE OF THE VEDAS

Q. How many years have elapsed since the Vedas were revealed ?

A. One *Vṛnda* (i.e. Arab) ninety six crores, eight lacs, fifty two thousands, nine hundreds and seventy six years (i.e. 1,96,08,52,976 years) have passed and the current year is the seventy seventh (1,96,08,52,977th year).* The equal number of years has passed in the current *Kalpa* since the creation.

Q. How do you ascertain that only so many years (and not more or less) have elapsed ?

A. We ascertain it, because in the current creation (i.e. *Kalpa*) the seventh "*Manvantara*" called "*Vaivasvat*" is running. Six "*Manvantaras*" have already passed before this. These seven "*Manus*" (or *Manvantaras*) are styled as *Svāyambhuva*, *Svārociṣa*, *Auttami*, *Tāmasa*, *Raivata*, *Cākṣuṣa* and *Vaivasvata*. The coming seven *Manus* are *Sāvarṇi* &c. All these, put together, make fourteen *Manvantaras*.

The duration of one *Manvantara* is seventy one "*Caturyugīs*" (i.e. four *Yugas*). These fourteen (*Manvantaras*) make one day of Brahman. One thousand "*Catur-yugis*" are the length of a day of Brahman. The night of Brahman is of the same duration. The period of cosmos is called 'day' and the time of dissolution is termed as 'night'.

In the present day of Brahman, six *Manus* have elapsed. The seventh *Manvantara*, called the *Vaivasvata* is running. During this

---

* It refers to 1933 Vikrama Era when the author wrote this work. According to Śrī Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, this calculation omits seven *Sandhis*, intervening each *Manvantara*. To get the correct total, one must add period of 'seven' *Sandhis* (1728000×7=) 12096000 years to above mentioned total. It would give us correct total of 1972948976 years. I also agree with him. Otherwise we shall not get *Brāhma* day, consisting of one thousand *Caturvugas* which is clearly accepted by Svāmī Dayānanda here in original. Detailed calculation is given in our notes.

(seventh *Manvantara*) the 28th *Kali-yuga* is passing on. Four thousands nine hundreds and seventy six years (4976) have already rolled by in the present *Kali* age. The current year is the seventy seventh (i.e. 4977) which the Āryas call the Saṃvat 1933 according to the Vikrama Era. Here we cite below the authority of Manu :—

(1) "Now listen the brief (description) of the duration of a day and night of Brahman and of all the ages (of the universe) in their respective order."

(2) "Four thousands (i.e. 4000) years (of the *Devas*) make the "*Kṛta*" age. *Sandhyā** (the preceding twilight) consists of so many hundred years (i. e. 400) and *Sandhyā-aṃśa*, (the succeeding twilight) is of the same number (of years i.e. 400).

(3) "In other three ages (i.e. *Tretā, Dvāpara* and *Kali*) with their *Sandhyās* and *Sandhyā-aṃśas* (i.e. the preceding and sccceeding twilights) the thousands and the hundreds are (diminished) by deducting one in each."

---

(1) "ब्राह्मस्य तु क्षपाहस्य यत्प्रमाणं समासतः ।
एकैकशो युगानां तु क्रमशस्तन्निबोधत ॥"

(2) "चत्वार्याहुः सहस्राणि वर्षाणां तत्कृतं युगम् ।
तस्य तावच्छती सन्ध्या, सन्ध्यांशश्च तथाविधः ॥"

* The words *Sandhyā* and *Sandhyā-aṃśa* are explained by Kullūka Bhaṭṭa here as "युगस्य पूर्वा सन्ध्या, उत्तरश्च सन्ध्यांशः ।"

cf. तत्प्रमाणैः शतैः सन्ध्या पूर्वा तत्राभिधीयते ।
सन्ध्यांशकश्च तत्तुल्यो युगस्यानन्तरो हि यः ॥
सन्ध्यासन्ध्यांशयोरन्तर्यः कालो मुनिसत्तम ।
युगाख्यः स तु विज्ञेयः कृतत्रेतादिरूपकः ॥ (*VP* विष्णु पुराणे)

cf. दिव्यैः वर्षसहस्रैस्तु कृतत्रेतादिसंज्ञितम् ।
चतुर्युगं द्वादशभिः तद्विभागं निबोध मे ॥ (*VP*)

cf. तद्द्वादशसहस्राणि चतुर्युगमुदाहृतम् ।
सूर्याब्दसंख्यया द्वित्रिसागरैरयुता हतैः ॥ (*SS*. I. 15)

(3) "इतरेषु ससन्ध्येषु ससन्ध्यांशेषु च त्रिषु ।
एकापायेन वर्तन्ते सहस्राणि शतानि च ॥"

(4) "These four (human) ages, which we have just enumerated, make one age of the gods (*Devas*) consisting of twelve thousand years (12,000)."

(5) "The sum total of one thousand (1000) ages of the *Devas* (i.e. 1000 *Catur-Yugīs*) makes one day of Brahman and His night is also of the same duration."

(6) "Those, who understand that the holy day of Brahman, ends with the expiry of 1,000 *Yugas* (i.e. *Catur-yugīs*) of the gods and His night is also of the same length, are indeed experts in (the calculation of) days and nights."

(7) "The above described age or *Yuga* of the *Devas*, which consists of 12,000 (divine) years, when multiplied by 71 is called here as one *Manvantara*.*

---

(4) "यदेतत् परिसंख्यातमादावेव चतुर्युगम् ।
एतद् द्वादशसाहस्रं देवानां युगमुच्यते ।।"

(5) "दैविकानां युगानां तु सहस्रं परिसंख्यया ।
ब्राह्ममेकमहर्ज्ञेयं तावती रात्रिरेव च ।।"

(6) "तद्वै युगसहस्रान्तं ब्राह्मं पुण्यमहर्विदुः ।
रात्रिं च तावतीमेव तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ।।"

cf. "इत्थं युगसहस्रेण भूतसंहारकारकः ।
कल्पो ब्राह्ममहः प्रोक्तं शर्वरी तस्य तावती ।।" (*SS.* I. 20)

In the Bhagvad-gītā the same thing has been explained very briefly yet lucidly in the following one verse :—

"सहस्रयुगपर्य्यन्तमहर्यद् ब्रह्मणो विदुः ।
रात्रिं युगसहस्रान्तां तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ।।" (*BG.* VIII 17)

(7) "प्राग् द्वादशसाहस्रमुदितं दैविकं युगम् ।
तदेकसप्ततिगुणं मन्वन्तरमिहोच्यते ।।"

* In the *Surya-Siddhanta*, the *Manvantara* is described in more simple words, as :—

"युगानां सप्ततिः सैका मन्वन्तरमिहोच्यते ।" (I. 18)

We are further told here that after every *Manvantara*, there is '*jala-plava*' over the earth. the duration of which is similar to the age of the *Kṛita*.

cf. "कृताब्दसंख्यस्तस्यान्ते सन्धिः प्रोक्तो जलप्लवः ।।" (*SS*)

(8) "These *Manvantaras* are countless. The creation and the dissolution (of the world) are also (numberless). They are, as it were, sportings of the Most High (*Parameṣṭhin*) who creates it again and again.* (MS. I. 68-73 and 79, 80)

---

(8) "मन्वन्तराण्यसंख्यानि सर्गः संहार एव च ।
क्रीडन्निवैतत् कुरुते परमेष्ठी पुनः पुनः ॥" (*MS.* I. 68-73, 79-80)

* In the above cited last verse, Manu says that the workings of God are beyond human calculations. He is eternal and His functions are also eternal and beyond human imagination.

The sportive character of God is also described in the *Śārīrika Sūtra*, as :—

"लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम् ।" (*VDD.* II. 1.33)

The cycle of creation is eternal and endless.

cf. "सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् ।" (*RV.* X. 191.3)

Here the word "*Yathā-pūrvam*" deserves notice.

This calculation of the Brahman's Day and Night is very popular in Indian Astronomy.

We have already quoted verses from the *Sūrya-siḍḍhānta, Manu-smṛti* and *Bhagavad-gītā*, which clearly explain the theory. Yāska in his *Nirukta* (XIV. 4) refers to this calculation and explains the gradual evolution of this universe :—

"युगसहस्रं रात्रिः । तौ एतौ अहोरात्रावजस्रं परिवर्त्तेते । स कालस्तदेतद्बहुर्भवति ।"

"युगसाहस्रपर्यन्तमहर्यद् ब्रह्मणो विदुः ।
रात्रिं युगसहस्रान्तां तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ॥"

This calculation is also found in the *Mahābhārata* (*Śāntiparva*—231) and also in the *Sūrya-siḍḍhānta.*

Dayānanda has mentioned here names of a few *Manus*, which have already elapsed. The names of the succeeding *Manvantaras* have been omitted. They are enumerated here in full :—

1. *Svāyaṁbhuva*, 2. *Svārociṣa*, 3. *Auttama*, 4. *Tāmasa*, 5. *Raivata*, 6. *Cākṣuṣa*, 7. *Vaivasvata*, 8. *Sāvarṇi*, 9. *Dakṣa Sāvarṇi*, 10. *Brahma Sāvarṇi*, 11. *Dharma Sāvarṇi*, 12. *Rudra Sāvarṇi*, 13. *Deva Sāvarṇi*, 14. *Indra Sāvarṇi.*

The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* also enumerates in detail all these aspects of the creation. We have already cited a few verses from this work.

The terms e.g. the Day of Brahman and the Night of Brahman, have been coined for measuring time and they are easy to be comprehended. In this way the calculation of the age of creation and dissolution of the world and also of the Vedic revelation becomes very easy. A *Manvantara* is so termed as with the change of a *Manvantara* there is a slight (*kiñcit*) modification (*paryāvartana*) in the causitive qualities of the creation (*Naimittika guṇas*)*

Following is the system of calculation here :—

(9) "*Eka*=1, *Daśa*=10, *Śata*=100, *Sahasra*=1000, *Ayuta*=10000, *Lakṣa*=100000, *Niyuta*=10.00.000, *Koṭi*=10.000.000, *Arbuda*=100.000.000,"

(10) "*Vṛnda*=1.000.000.000, *Kharva*=10.000.000.000, *Nikharva*=100.000.000.000, *Śaṅkha*=1.000.000.000.000, *Padma*=10.000.000.-000.000, *Sāgara*=100.000.000.000.000, *Antya*=1.000.000.000.000.-000, *Madhya*=10.000.000.000.000.000, *Parārdhya*=100.000.000.-000.000.000, and so on multiplying by 10 respectively."

This enumeration is according to the *Sūrya-Siḍḍhānta* &c.

(11) "Thou art (O God) the Measurer of *Sahasra* and the Creator of *Sahasra*." (YV. XV. 65)

(12) "*Saharsra* is verily *Sarva* (i.e. all *Viśva*) and Thou art the Giver of *Sarva*." (*SP*. VII. 5.2.13)

---

* Sri Ghasi Ram M. A., LL. B. translates the phrase "सृष्टेः नैमित्तिकगुणानामपि पर्यावर्त्तनम्" as follows :—

"Modifications occur in the external arrangement of creation." It is wholly wrong. The words नैमित्तिक गुणानाम् do not mean "external arrangement." '*Guṇas*' denote "qualities" and '*Naimittika*' means pertaining to some '*nimitta*' i.e. cause. Moreover in his translation he omits the word "*kiñcit*" i.e. "slight".

(9) "एकं दश शतं चैव सहस्रमयुतं तथा ।
लक्षं च नियुतं चैव कोटिरर्बुदमेव च ॥"

(10) "वृन्दः खर्वो निखर्वश्च शङ्खः पद्मं च सागरः ।
अन्त्यं मध्यं परार्ध्यं च दशवृद्धया यथाक्रमात् ॥" (Reference not traceable)

(11) "सहस्रस्य प्रमासि सहस्रस्य प्रतिमाऽसि ॥" (*YV*. XV. 65)

(12) "सर्वं वै सहस्रं, सर्वस्य दाताऽसि ॥" (*SP*. VII. 5.2.13)

Here the word *Sarva* is the name of the whole world, as well as of the time. as God is the Measurer (*Pramā*) and Reckoner (*Pratimā*) of the universe, where Day and Night (of Brahman) are consisted of one thousand *Mahā-yugas*. Hence, the *Mantra* occurs in general sense (described above).*

The treatises on Astronomical science describe the daily rotations of time (e.g. daily movements and changes-*Tithi*, *Nakṣatra* and *Grahas*).†

---

* The author means to say here that the calculation of Brahman's Day and Night has its origin in the Vedic texts. The world is called *Sahasra* because its existence and dissolution (i.e. Brahman's Day and Brahman's Night) consist of 1000 *Mahā-yugas* or *Catur-yugīs* each.

Dayānanda is original in his Vedic interpretations. No other commentator so far has given this scientific interpretation of this *Mantra*. He really is a *Ṛṣi*.

Yudhishṭhira Mīmāṁsaka proposes a correction in the original Sanskrit text as "सहस्रम्" in place of "सर्वम्" on the basis of "Hindi version". I do not agree. Dayānanda wrote or dictated the Sanskrit text only. Hindi rendering was done by some Panditas which is often wrong and contradictory.

† Sri Ghasi Ram wrongly translates the sentence "ज्योतिष् शास्त्रे प्रतिदिनचर्याऽभिहिता" as "works on astronomical sciences lay down rules for daily observances".

Here the word "*caryā*" is derived from the root √*car* (to move), "*caryā*" therefore means progress or rotation. All planets and stars show daily rotations which are calculated in the works on Astronomical science.

In order to elucidate this point I cite below a few instances from Sanskrit literature showing the root √*car*, used in the sense of "to walk, move, go about, roam, or wander" :

(a) "नष्टाशङ्काहरिणशिशवो मन्दमन्दं चरन्ति ।" (*Ś*. I. 15)

(b) "इन्द्रियाणां हि चरताम् ।" (*BG*. II. 67)

(c) "तस्यां त्वं साधु नाचर: ।" (*RV*. I. 76)

In Astronomical works "*Car*" is also used as noun. This has under-mentioned meanings :—

(I) The planet Mars i.e. *Maṅgala*.

(II) Hence *Tuesday*.

(III) The seventh *Karaṇa* in Astrology.

The Āryas have clearly calculated and calculate even today according to Mathematical science the divisions of time from *Kṣaṇa* (i.e. 4/5th of a second) upto *Kalpa* and *Kalpānta.* This (calculation) is repeatedly pronounced daily (in the beginning of their all religious or secular undertakings) and is known (to all).

Therefore, all men must accept this firmly established doctrine (*vyavasthā*) (regarding the date of the Vedic revelation) and should accept none else ; because, the Āryas repeat (the following) formula daily :—

(13) "*Om, Tat-Sat.* I performed or (will) perform this (act) in the second quarter (*Prahara-ardha*) of the Day of Brahman, in the first quarter of the 28th Kali age of the *Vaivasvata-Manvantara* in such and such year, solstice, season, month and fortnight (*pakṣa*), on such and such day, under such and such constellation, and at such and such moment of the Sun's entrance into a Zodical sign and at such an hour."

This (formula) is a matter of daily routine (*lit.* known) to all the Āryas—young or old—and this tradition (*lit.* History or *Itihāsa*) is prevalent everywhere in India (*Āryāvarta*) in an identical form. Hence it is impossible for any one to set aside this firmly established doctrine (*vyavasthā*). This (fact) therefore must be clearly understood.

(Contd. from page 33)

(IV) The *Karaṇas,* taken collectively.

(V) The difference of time between two Meridians.

(VI) The first, fourth, seventh and tenth Signs of the Zodiac.

The interested reader may refer to the books on Astronomy here and will come across numberless instances there : *Caryā* also means in A stronomy :—

(i) a course.

(ii) a motion as in *Rāhu-caryā.*

In *Tapaṣ-caryā* it means a "practice".

(13) "ओम् तत् सत्। श्री ब्रह्मणो द्वितीयप्रहरार्धे वैवस्वतमन्वन्तरेऽष्टाविंशतितमे कलियुगे कलिप्रथमचरणेऽमुकसंवत्सरायनर्तुमासपक्षदिननक्षत्रलग्नमुहूर्त्तेऽत्रेदं कृतं क्रियते चेति ॥"

We shall explain *Yuga*s in more detail later on.*

---

* It will be read with interest, the detailed calculation of the Day of Brahman, given below according to *Manu* and the *Sūryasiddhānta* :—

Note :—360 human years = 1 year of the *Devas.*

1.	Duration of *Kṛtayuga*	... 4000	(years of the *Devas*)
2.	Duration of *Tretāyuga*	... 3000	-do-
3.	Duration of *Dvāpara*	... 2000	-do-
4.	Duration of *Kalīyuga*	... 1000	-do-
	Total	10000	Divine years

The intervals between the preceding and succeeding *Yugas* are called *Sandhyā* and *Sandhhyāṃśa.* (*Sandhyā* is a preceding twilight and *Sandhyāṃṣa*, a succeeding twilight)

		Duration	
1. (a)	Sandhyā of *Kṛtayuga*	400	(years of the *Devas*)
(b)	Sandhyāṃśa of *Kṛtayuga*	400	-do-
2. (a)	Sandhyā of *Tretāyuga*	300	-do-
(b)	Sandhyāṃśa of *Tretāyuga*	300	-do-
3. (a)	Sandhyā of *Dvāpara*	200	-do-
(b)	Sandhyāṃśa of *Dvāpara*	200	-do-
4. (a)	Sandhyā of *Kaliyuga*	100	-do-
(b)	Sandhyāṃśa of *Kaliyuga*	100	-do-
	Total	2000	

The grand total would be :—

Duration of 4 Yugas	10000	
Duration of Sandhis	2000	
Total	12000	(years of the *Devas*)

Thus these 12000 years of all *Yugas* are styled as one *Caturyugī* or one *Mahāyuga.*

Following are the human years of this *Caturyugī* or *Mahāyuga* :

360 human days or one human year = one day of the *Devas.*
360 human years = one year of the *Devas.*

(Contd.)

(Contd. from page 35)

(a) Now 12000×360=4,320,000 human years which make the duration of a *Caturyugī* or *Mahāyuga* according to our calculation.

(b) 1000 such *Caturyugis* make one Day of Brahman.

Thus

12000× 1000=12000000 years of *Devas*.

or

4320000× 1000=4320000000 human years.

(c) A Day of Brahman = 12000000 years of the *Devas*.

or

Day of Brahman = 4320000000 human years.

We can come to the same conclusion by the following calculation also which is more lucid and simple :—

71 *Caturyugīs* = 1 *Manvantara*.

14 *Manvantaras*= 1 Day of Brahman.

While calculating the duration of 14 *Manvantaras*, we must add 15 *Sandhis* of *jalaplavas* (one in the beginning and one at the end of the each *Manvantara*). Each *jalaplava* or *Sandhi* is equal to a *Kṛtayuga*.

(a) 1 *Manvantara* = 71 *Caturyugas* or
4320000 × 71 = 306, 720, 000 human years.

(b) 14 *Manvantaras*=306, 720, 000× 14=4294, 080, 000 human years.

(c) 15 *Sandhis* of *Manvantaras*; equal to the age of *Kṛtayuga* i.e. 1, 728, 000×15=25, 920, 000 human years.

Now we sum up as follows :—

		Human years.
1.	Duration of 14 *Manvantaras* ...	4, 294, 080, 000
2.	Duration of 15 *Sandhis* ...	25, 920, 000
3.	Total duration of Brahman's day or grand total	4, 320, 000, 000

Note :—One day of Brahman consists of 1000 *Caturyugīs* because 71×14=994. To this if we add 6 *Caturyugīs*, the duration of 15 *Sandhis* we get 1000 *Caturyugīs*. 15 *Sandhis* are equal to the duration of *Caturyugīs*. *Manu*, Dayānanda and the author of *Sūrya-siddhānta* accept this calculation i.e. 71 × 14=994+6=1000). (Contd.)

(Contd. from page 36)

The duration of the Night of Brahman is equal to His day. Thus :—

		Human years
(a)	Brahman's Day	4, 320, 000, 000
(b)	Brahman's Night	4, 320, 000, 000
	total	8, 640, 000, 000

In order to come to the date of the Vedic revelation as described above in the text by our author, we must take into consideration the following verses from the *Sūryasiddhānta* :—

"कल्पादस्माच्च मनवः षड् व्यतीताः ससन्धयः ।
वैवस्वतस्य च मनोः युगानां त्रिघनो गतः ॥
अष्टाविंशात् युगादस्मात् यातमेतत् कृतं युगम् ॥" (I. 22-23)

i.e. In this *Kalpa* or Day of Brahman six *Manus* with (their 7) *Sandhis* have elapsed. In the present *Vaivasvata Manvantara* 27 *Caturyugīs* have also passed. The 28th *Kṛtayuga* also rolled by. Ṛṣi Dayānanda wrote this book in the *Kali* age which is the 28th one in the current *Manvantara*.

The author of the *Sūryasiddhānta*, further calculates years upto the period when he wrote his work (i.e. at the end of the *Kṛtayuga*) :—

"षण्मनूनां तु सम्पीड्य कालं तत्सन्धिभिः सह ।
कल्पादिसन्धिना सार्धं वैवस्वतमनोस्तथा ॥
युगानां त्रिघनं यातं तथा कृतयुगं त्विदम् ।
प्रोह्य सृष्टेस्ततः कालं पूर्वोक्तं दिव्यसंख्यया ॥
सूर्याब्दसंख्यया ज्ञेया कृतस्यान्ते गता अमी ।
ख-चतुष्क-यमाद्र्यग्नि-शर-रन्ध्र-निशाकराः ॥" (*Sūryasihddānta*)

According to this calculation, at the end of the 28th *Kṛtayuga* in this *Vaivasvata Manvantara* 1, 953, 720, 000 solar years elapsed (when the *Sūryasiddhānta* was written according to its author.

Thus to get the correct total of passed human years (when the work was written by our author (1933 V.E.), we must add the duration of passed 7 *Sandhis* (1728000 × 7 =)12096000 years to the above stated passed years 1960852976 (1960852976 + 12096000 =) 1972948976. It is exact

(Contd,)

From these arguments (*lit.* statement) it is quite evident that the contention of European Professors Max Muller, Wilson &c that the Vedas are of human and not of divine origin and also their verdict that the Vedas were composed 2400 or 2900 or 3000 or 3100 years back, are based on delusion. Similarly, the similar versions of the Vernacular commentators of the Vedas are also erroneous.

(Contd. from page 37)

calculation of the past years. Similarly we have to add the period of 8 future (*bhogya*) *Sandhis* ($1728000 \times 8 =$)13824000 to the total (given by our author) of coming years and this will give us correct total ($2333227024 + 13824000 =$)2347051024. Thus :

Śuddha Bhukta-kāla = 1972948976

Śuddha Bhogya-kāla = 2347051024

Total 4320000000=(1000 *Caturyugas* or a Day of *Brahman* or a *Kalpa*).

Our author in his Sanskrit text (and also in Hindhi version) clearly states that the date of the Vedas is the same as that of the creation. He does not give different dates for creation and of revelation :—

cf : **जितने वर्ष अभी ऊपर गिन आये हैं उतने ही वर्ष वेदों की और जगत् की उत्पत्ति में भी हो चुके हैं ।।** (*Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā*. page 29).

THE PERPETUITY OF THE VEDAS

As the Vedas are revealed (*lit.* produced) by God, their eternity is self-evident (*svataḥ*) because all His powers are eternal.

Here some may object that the eternity of the Vedas cannot be established as they are consisted of words and words, like a pitcher, are effects (i.e. things created or fashioned). As a pitcher is a created thing (i.e. effect) so is a word. The words being non-perpetual, the Vedas should be confessed to be so. But this cannot be accepted so, because words are two-fold (1) eternal and (2) non-eternal (i.e. effects). The relations of words and imports, existing in the knowledge of Supreme Self must (naturally) be eternal ; but those words which dwell in ours (i.e. in human knowledge) are effects (i.e. non-eternal). As all His powers must be eternal, so His knowledge and acts are eternal, inherently innate and beginningless. As the Vedas are knowledge of such a Being, their non-eternity is not tenable (i.e. they cannot be called effects or non-eternal like a pitcher).

Q. How can you accept eternity of the Vedas, as there were no books in existence for (the acts of) learning and teaching (at the time) when this entire universe stood dissolved and disintegrated in its original (*lit.* causal) form and when all gross effects were non-existent ?

A. This (objection) is possible with respect to the things e.g. books, paper, ink & c and also with respect to our (human) actions only but not in other respects (i.e. in case of Divine acts and powers). We observe the Vedas to be eternal as they are a part of God's knowledge.*

Moreover, non-eternity of the Vedas cannot be established, simply on the ground that all books (employed) in learning and teaching are non-eternal, as they perpetually exist as a part of

---

* Cf. (a) "तस्यैवैतस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेवैतद् यदृग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्वणः ॥"

(b) "यस्मिन्नृचः सामयजूंषि···प्रतिष्ठिता रथनाभाविवाराः ।"

(*YV*. XXXIV. 5)

God's knowledge. The relations of words, letters and meanings in the Vedas in this *Kalpa* are the same as they were in the past and they will remain similar in future also; because God's knowledge is eternal and infallible. Hence it is said in the Ṛgveda :—

(1) "The Creator made the Sun and the Moon just in the same manner as He had created them before." (ṚV. X.190.3)

This is to say : here the words 'the Sun and the Moon (in the verse) are synecdoche (*upalakṣaṇa*) for the whole class.* The meaning is that the plan of the creation of the Sun and the Moon is the same in the present *Kalpa* as it was in God's knowledge in the previous *Kalpa*. Because God's knowledge is unchangable and (hence) is not liable to increase or decrease. The same fact must be admitted in respect of the Vedas as they are consisted of His knowledge.

Now we cite a few quotations from the Grammatical treatise etc. as evidence to prove the eternity of the Vedas. Sage Patañjali, the author of the Mahābhāṣya, says :—

(2) "Words are eternal. Eternal words must consist of perpetual (*Kūṭastha*) and changelessly immoveable letters, which are not liable to elision (*apāya*), augmentation and substitution (*upajana-vikāras*)." (*MB.* 1)

---

(1) "सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् ॥" (*ṚV.* X. 190.3)

* *Upalakṣaṇa* means : "स्वप्रतिपादकत्वे सति स्वेतरप्रतिपादकत्वम् ॥" i.e. implying something that has not been expressed actually ; Implication of something in addition or any similar object where only one is mentioned. Synecdoche of a part for the whole, of an individual for the species or of a quality for that where the quality exists. "मन्त्रग्रहणं ब्राह्मणस्याप्युपलक्षणम् ॥"

(*SK.* on P. II. 4.80)

(2) "नित्याः शब्दाः। नित्येषु शब्देषु कूटस्थैरविचालिभिर्वर्णैः भवितव्यम्, अनपायोपजनविकारिभिः ॥ इति ॥" (*MB.* I)

Here *Upajana* means *Āgama* described as "मित्रवदागमः". *Vikāra* indicates change or substitution. "शत्रुवदादेशः।"

This statement frequently occurs in the Mahābhāṣya from the first *Āhnika* onwards. Moreover :—

(3) "The word or sound (*Śabda*) is that which is grasped through the ear, understood by the intellect, made manifest by being pronounced and of which free space or vacuity is the substratum." (*MB*. I)

This (observation) occurs in the commentary on the aphorism, "अइउण्". It means that all words, whether Vaidika (found in the Vedas) or Laukika (used in the world by mankind) are eternal, because these words are consisted of letters which are perpetual, immovable and are not subject to elisions, augmentation or variation. Words are imperishable as there is no *Apāya* (disappearance) or *Lopa* (i.e. elision) or augmentation (*Upajana*) or *Vikāra* (substitution).

Q. How can be it justified when there are (definite) rules or injunctions for *Apāya* (elision) &c in the *Gaṇapāṭha*, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Mahābhāṣya* ?

A. To this objection, retorts the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* (as follows) :—

(4) "Complete words are substituted by complete words ; according to Pāṇini, the son of Dākṣī. The eternalness of words can never be established if the change takes place in one portion (*Eka-deśa*) only." (*MB*.)

---

(3) "श्रोत्रोपलब्धिः, बुद्धिनिर्ग्राह्यः, प्रयोगेणाभिज्वलितः आकाशदेशः शब्दः ।" (*MB*. I)

The word *Śabda* is derived from the root, √*Śabd* (X.U. शब्दायति-ते) to speak, to sound or make noise with suffix *Ghañ*. *Śabda* means sound, the object of the sense of hearing and property of *Ākaśa*,

cf. (a) "अथात्मनः शब्दगुणं गुणज्ञः पदं विमानेन विगाहमानः ।" (*R*. XIII. 1)

(b) "आकाशस्य तु विज्ञेयः शब्दो वैशेषिको गुणः ।" (*N.S.M*)

(c) "श्रुतिविषयगुणा या स्थिता व्याप्य विश्वम् ।" (*S*. I. 1)

The Logicians describe "*Śabda*" as "आप्तोपदेशः शब्दः" (*ND*)

(4) "सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः ।
एकदेशविकारे तु नित्यत्वं नोपपद्यते ॥" (*MB*)

That is to say : complete sets (of letters) are replaced by other complete sets i.e. specific groups are substituted for specific groups. For instance "वेदपारग:+अभवत्" । this group (of letters) is used in place of another group "वेदपार । गम् । ड । सु । भू । शप् । तिप्" ।*

It is erroneous to think that in this later group "अम्, ड्, उ, श्, प्, इ, प्" are elided respectively from "गम्, ड, सु, शप्, तिप्" in the (former) group ; because it has been said (in the above quotation) that the change does not take place in a portion only. In the opinion of *Ācārya* Pāṇini, the son of Dākṣī, the perpetuity of words (or sounds) would not be possible if elision, augmentation and variation were to be admitted to a portion only. Similar is the case when "*Aṭ*" is augmented or '*BHŪ*' is converted into '*BHO*'. The definition of a word (or sound) is that which is perceived with the organ of hearing, grasped by intellect, made manifest by pronouncement and of which space is the substratum (*Deśa* or *Adhikaraṇa*). This definition of word also proves that the word is possitively eternal. The effort made in uttering (a letter) and the act of hearing (the same) ceases to exist after (the particular) moment. The author of the *Mahābhāṣya* says :—

(5) The speech resides in one (particular) letter (which is being pronounced) at a time. (*MB.* 1)

---

* According to Pāṇini's Grammer, the sentence "वेदपारग: अभवत्" । is accomplished in the following manner :—

"पार+गम्" अत्र "अन्तात्यन्ताध्वदूरपारसर्वानन्तेषु ड:" (P. III. 2.48) इत्यनेन "ड:" । "डित्त्वादभस्यापि टे: लोप:" ।

"*Abhavat*" is from the root √*Bhū* with suffix शप् and तिप् . The शप् is from "कर्त्तरि शप्" (*P.* III. 1. 68)

(5) "एकैकवर्णवर्त्तिनी वाक् ।" (*MB*)

To elucidate clearly this point we may cite below a few quotations from some authentic works :—

(a) "अथ शब्दानुशासनम् । ··· ··· अथ गौरित्यत्र क: शब्द: ? किं यत्तत् सास्नालाङ्गूलककुदखुरविषाण्यर्थरूपं स: शब्द: ? नेत्याह । द्रव्यं नाम तत्, ··· ··· कस्तर्हि शब्द: ? येनोच्चारितेन सास्नालाङ्गूलककुदखुरविषाणिनां सम्प्रत्ययो भवति स शब्द: । अथवा प्रतीतपदार्थको लोके ध्वनि: शब्द इत्युच्यते । तद् यथा—शब्दं कुरु, मा शब्दं कार्षी:, शब्दकार्ययं माणवक इति ध्वनिं कुर्वन्नेवमुच्यते । तस्मात् ध्वनि: शब्द: ।।" (*MB.* I. 1.1)

(b) "प्रधानभूतस्फोटरूपव्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकस्य शब्दस्य ध्वनिरिति व्यवहार: ।" (*KP.* 1)

(c) स च ध्वन्यात्मक: । शब्दो नित्य: ब्रह्मस्वरूप: सकलप्रत्येयप्रत्यायनक्षम: अङ्गीक्रियते । तत् व्यञ्जक: वर्णात्मक: शब्द: । (*Sārabodhinī*)

The act of utterence terminates with the pronunciation of a particular letter. Hence the action of speech and not the word (or sound) is non-eternal.

Q. The word comes into existence and also perishes, like the action of speech. i.e. When pronounced, it comes into existence and if not pronounced, it does not exist. How can it be, then, eternal ?

A. A word, like space (*Ākāśa*) pre-exists but in the absence of means, it remains unmanifested. But it becomes manifest by the action of speech and breath (*Prāṇa* i.e. *Śvāsa* or vital airs). For instance, in the word "*gauḥ*" when the action of speech is on '*g*', it does not exist on '*au*' and while it is on '*au*' it has nothing to do with "*visargas*." Thus the action of speech and the act of pronunciation only have elision and augmentation and not the word itself which is indivisible, uniform and available every where. Neither the pronunciation nor the hearing (of a word) is possible if there are no acts of speech and air. Consequently the words are eternal like Space or Aether (*Ākāśa*). Thus according to Grammatical scienee, all words are eternal and what to speak of the Vedic words !

Similarly the sage Jaimini has also established the perpetuity of words. (He says) :—

(6) "It (word) is verily eternal as it is manifested for the sake of others." (*MD*. I. 1.18)

This aphorism means as follows :—

Here the word "verily (*tu*)" is used to remove all doubts regarding the non-eternalness of words. Being imperishable, the word is eternal; because, its manifestation is for the sake of others. The purpose of manifestation or pronunciation is to communicate information to another. Thus the word is not non-eternal. Otherwise, the perception (*Abhijñā*) that "such and such was the import or cannotation of the word" is not possible by means of a perishable word.* This is tenable only if words are admitted

---

(6) "नित्यस्तु स्यात् दर्शनस्य परार्थत्वात् ॥" (*MD*. I. 1.18)

* Here the word "*Abhijñā*" means "*Abhijñāna*" or "*Prati-abhijñā*." It indicates 'recognition'. "*Abhijñāna*" is a combination of "*Anubhava*" of direct perception and of "*Smṛti*" or recollection, a sort of direct perception, assisted by memory; as when we say, "This is the same man I saw yesterday."

(Contd.)

to be eternal. (In that case) both, the signifier (i.e. the word) and the thing signified are existent. That is why many speakers are able to pronounce simultaneously the same word "COW" at different places and are also able to utter it at different times.

Thus, Jaimini has advanced a number of arguments in support of (the theory of) eternalness of words.

Moreover, the sage Kaṇāda, the author of the "*Vaiśeṣika*" aphorism also says :—

(7) "The Vedas are authentic because they are His word."
(*VD.* I. 1.3)

This is to say that all men should admit the authority of the four Vedas because they enjoin the performances of Dharma as duty and also because they are the word of God and thus eternal.

Similarly, the sage Gautama also says in his *Nyāyaśāstra* :—

(8) "Its authenticity is like that of the *Mantras* and *Āyurveda* (i.e. Science of Medicine) because the credibillity of the *Āptas* (i.e. trustworthy persons) is (quite natural)." (*ND.* II. 1.68)

(Contd. from page 43)

(सोऽयं यो दृष्टो नर:); "*Anubhava*" or direct perception leading to the identification expressed by "*Ayam*" and memory leading to the past reference expressed by "*Saḥ.*"

cf. "अभिज्ञावचने लृट् ।" (*P.* III. 2.112)

"स्मृतिबोधिन्युपपदे भूतानद्यतने लृट् । स्मरसि कृष्ण, गोकुले वत्स्याम: ।।"
(*Siddhānta-kaumudī*)

(7) "तद् वचनादाम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम् ।।" (*VD.* I. 1.3)

(8) "मन्त्रायुर्वेदप्रामाण्यवच्च तत्प्रामाण्यम् । आप्तप्रामाण्यात् ।।" (*ND.* II. 1.68)

This aphorism has been explained by Vātsyāyana in his commentary as follows :—

"किं पुनरायुर्वेदस्य प्रामाण्यम् । यत्तदायुर्वेदेनोपदिश्यते । "इदं कृत्वा इष्टमधिगच्छति, इदं वर्जयित्वाऽनिष्टं जहाति" इति तस्यानुष्ठीयमानस्य तथाभाव:=सत्यार्थता=अविपर्यय:, मन्त्रपदानां च विषभूताशनिप्रतिषेधार्थानां प्रयोगेऽर्थस्य तथाभाव: । एतत्—प्रामाण्यम् । किं कृतमेतत् ? आप्तप्रामाण्यकृतम् । किं पुनराप्तानां प्रामाण्यम् ? साक्षात्कृतधर्मता, भूतदया, यथाभूतार्थचिख्यापयिषेति । आप्ता: खलु साक्षात्कृतधर्माण: ।।"

(Contd.)

The significance is that all men should admit the authenticity of these Vedas, which are eternal and are "the Word of God." Why so ? Because all the credible (*Āptas*), great Yogins, Brahman &c who were righteous, free from all defects such as deception and treachery, merciful, preceptors of truth, masters of learning (*lit.* gone across) have admitted the authenticity of the Vedas in the same manner as that of the *Mantras* and the *Āyurveda*.*

(Contd. from page 44)

Sudarśana further explains it :—

"तत्—तस्य शब्दस्य-वेदवाक्यस्य प्रामाण्यं सिद्धम्—आप्तप्रामाण्यात्=वाक्योपदेशकानामाप्तानां प्रामाण्यात्=मन्त्रायुर्वेदप्रामाण्यवदिति सूत्रान्वय: ।।"

The "*Anumāna-Prakṛiyā*" is like this :—

'वेदवाक्यं प्रमाणम् (प्रतिज्ञा), आप्तप्रामाण्यात् (हेतु:), मन्त्रायुर्वेदवाक्यवत् (दृष्टान्त:) ।।'

Dayānanda accepts the explanation given by Vātsyāyana and has clarified this *Sūtra* accordingly. Vācaspati Miśra advances another reason in support of this theory :—

"When we accept the sayings of the worldly (*Āptas*) credible persons as authoritative, there is no reason why the Words of God, Who is the ultimate source of knowledge should not be taken as credible."

This aphorism can independently be explained as under :—

"तत्—तस्य वेदस्य (निखिलस्येति भाव:) प्रामाण्यं सिद्धम् । किमिव ? मन्त्रायुर्वेदवत् । मन्त्रेषु (वेदेषु) प्रतिपादितो य आयुर्वेद: तद्-वदिति । तत्र हेतुस्तु-आप्तप्रामाण्यात्=आप्तै: प्रमाणत्वेन स्वीकृतत्वात् ।।"

This is to say that the authoritativeness of the Vedas as a whole is established like the *Āyurveda*, which has been expounded in some *Mantras*. Here the reason is that all trustworthy people accept the authority of the Vedas.

* Here the word "*Mantra*", according to Dayānanda means '*Vicāra*' and not *Mantras* (spells and charms) used against *Bhūtas* and *Pretas* as accepted by Vātsyāyana in the previous quotation. Hence the author says :—

"मन्त्राणां = विचाराणाम् ।"

But Vātsyāyana in his commentary upon this aphorism takes the word *Mantra* in the sense of a charm, spell, or incantation as in **"सोऽहमस्मि**

(Contd.)

Just as one considers *Mantras*. revealing factual principles of material science, to be true and authoritative, when their truth is (experimentally) established ; and just as one on finding that the use of medicines, prescribed in one particular part of the *Āyurveda*, removes disease, comes to have faith on the similar part of the same, similarly on ascertaining (the truth of) a proposition stated in one part of the Vedas by direct perception (*Pratyakṣa*) one ought to have faith (*Prāmāṇyam*) in the contents of the remaining portions of the Vedas which describe subjects beyond (the range of) Direct Cognition. The sage Vātsyāyana has also stated to this effect in his commentary on this aphorism. He says :—

(Contd. from page 45)

मन्त्रसिद्धः" (*DK.* 54) and "अचिन्त्यो हि मणिमन्त्रौषधीनां प्रभावः ।।" Hence Vātsyāyana says : "मन्त्रपदानां च विषभूताशनिप्रतिषेधार्थानां प्रयोगे" (*ND.* II. 1.68)

The word *Mantra is* from the root √*Mantṛ* (10. A.) to consult, deliberate, ponder over, hold consultation or take counsel with suffix "*ac*". It is used in the following meanings :—

(I) A Vedic hymn. It is of 3 types :— it is called *Ṛc* if metrical and intended to be loudly recited; *Yajur*— if in prose, muttered in a low tone and *Sāman*—if being metrical, it is intended for singing (गीतिषु सामाख्या) ।

(II) A Vedic text including *Saṃhitā*.

(III) A charm or spell.

(IV) Consultation, deliberation, counsel, advice, resolution, plan.

cf. (a) 'तस्य संवृतमन्त्रस्य ।' (*R.* I. 20)

(b) "मन्त्रः प्रतिदिनं तस्य बभूव सह मन्त्रिभिः ।।" (*R.* XVII. 50)

(c) See also *Pañcatantra.* (2.182)

(d) *Manu-Smṛti* (VII. 58).

(V) Secret plan or consultation, a secret.

(VI) Policy, statesmanship.

Tne meaning taken by Dayānanda here falls in the fourth, fifth or sixth categories. We must note here the Vedic Text also :—

"समानो मन्त्रः समितिः समानी ।" (*AV*) etc.

(9) "This inference (*Anumāna*) is (drawn) from the identity of Seers and expositors. (That is to say that) the same trustworthy persons, who are Seers and expositors of the Vedas, are also the Seers and expositors of the *Āyurveda*, etc. Thus it is inferred that the Vedas are as much authentic as the Medical Science (*Āyurveda*). Hence it has been argued that the words of the Vedas are of eternal authority ; because they are accepted to be such by the trustworthy persons". (*ND*. II. 1. 68)

The implied sense (of this passage) is that as the word of a creditable person is authoritative, so the Vedas should also be accepted as authentic ; because they are also the Words of the Most perfectly trustworthy God and their authoritativeness has been admitted by all trustworthy persons. Hence briefly speaking, eternalness of the Vedas is (rightly) proved (by the fact that) they are God's knowledge.

Here, the sage Patañjali also refers to this topic in his *Yogaśāstra* :—

(10) "He is the Preceptor of the ancients also as He is not determined by time." (*YD*. I. 1.26)

God is the teacher of all—of the ancients who were born in the beginning of creation e. g. *Agni*, *Vāyu*, *Āditya*, *Aṅgiras*, *Brahmā* etc.—of the moderns, like ourselves—and of the persons, who are yet to be born in future. (God is called *Guru*) because he proclaims (*gṛṇāti*) or instructs the truthful objects by means of the Vedas.* He is eternal for all times, because

---

(9) "द्रष्टृ-प्रवक्तृसामान्याच्चानुमानम् । य एवाप्ता वेदार्थानां द्रष्टारः प्रवक्तारश्च त एवायुर्वेदप्रभृतीनामित्यायुर्वेदप्रामाण्यवद् वेदप्रामाण्यमनुमातव्यमिति । नित्यत्वाद् वेदवाक्यानां प्रमाणत्वे तत्प्रामाण्यमाप्तप्रामाण्यात्—इत्युक्तम् ॥" (*Vātsyāyana*=ND. II. 1.68)

(10) "स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात् ।" (*YD*. I. 1. 26)

* God is called *Guru*, the Preceptor. The word *Guru* is derived from the root √*GṚ* (9. P.) to announce, speak, utter, proclaim. cf : (R. X. 63). "*Gṛṇati iti Guruḥ*". This also means to invoke as in 'नामापि नाम गृणतामममृतत्वाय कल्पताम्' । (*MVC*. VII. 15)

It is also used in the sense "to praise or extol" as "केचिद् भीताः प्राञ्जलयो गृणन्ति" । (*BG*. XI. 21) and also see *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. (VIII. 77)

Here our author takes this word in the first sense.

(Contd.)

He is not affected by the process of time, (*Kāla-gater-apracārāt*). God is never touched by the afflictions of ignorance and sinful acts or their impressions (*vāsanās*). In Him, there is absolutely the highest eternal and innate knowledge. The Vedas, being His words, are eternal and full of truth.

Similarly in the fifth Chapter of the *Sāṅkhya-Śāstra*, Ācārya Kapila says :—

(11) "(The Vedas) having been revealed by His own power, have their self—authoritative character." (*SD.* V. 51)

This means that the self-authoritative and eternal character of the Vedas must be accepted as they have been brought to light by inseparably supreme power of God.

(Contd. from page 47)

The word "*Guru*" is used in the following meanings :—

(a) Father, न केवलं तद् गुरुरेकपार्थिवः ।
क्षितावभूदेकधनुर्धरोऽपि सः । (*R.* III. 31 ; 48 ; IV. 1 ; VIII. 29)

(b) Forefather or ancestor. (*URC.* V. 28)

(c) Any venerable person, an elderly man or relative.
cf. "शुश्रूषस्व गुरून्' (*S.* IV)
"गुरूनहत्वा हि महानुभावान्" (*BG.* II)

(d) A teacher or preceptor, particularly a religious teacher, spiritual preceptor. cf. "तौ गुरुः गुरुपत्नी च प्रीत्या प्रतिननन्दतुः ।" (*R.* I. 57)

(e) Technically, a "*Guru*" is one, who performs the purificatory ceremonies over a boy and instructs him in the Vedas :—
"स गुरुः य. क्रियाः कृत्वा वेदमस्मै प्रयच्छति ।" (*YS.* I. 34)

(f) A lord, head ruler :—
'वर्णाश्रमाणां गुरवे स वर्णी ।" (*R.* V. 19)
"गुरुः नृपाणां गुरवे निवेद्य ।" (*R.* II. 68)

(g) Name of *Vṛhaspati*.

(h) The planet Jupitor.

(i) The lunar asterism called *Puṣya*.

(j) Name of *Droṇa* or of *Prabhākara*. (MD.)

(k) The Supreme Spirit.

(11) "निजशक्त्यभिव्यक्तेः स्वतः प्रामाण्यम् ।" (*SḌ.* V. 51)

On this subject, the sage Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa also says in his Vedānta-śāstra : –

(12) "He is the Spring (source) of all Śāstras (Vedas)." (*V.D.D.* I. 1.3)

The import of this (aphorism) is that *Brahman* is the original cause of the Ṛg and the other Vedas, which are the magnified (*Upavṛṅhita*) repository of numberless sciences, and illuminate all objects like a lamp and thus He possesses (the title of) Omniscient. It is impossible to attribute authorship of such Śāstras as the Ṛg and the other Vedas, which are the home of entire universal knowledge (*Sarvajña-guṇa-anvitasya*) to some one else than the Omniscient God. It is very well known in the world that the particular person, who expounds in detail a particular science knows much more than what he writes (in his treatise) as Pāṇini in (the realm of) grammatical science. Ācārya Śaṅkara while explaining this aphorism has (clearly) stated :—

(13) "It is only to explain partly what he (the author) knows. He knows much more than that. This (point) is so well established in the world that it needs no (further) clarification." (*VDD*)

Thus it is concluded that the Śāstra, (attributed) to Omniscient God must be eternal and must contain knowledge of all and every thing.

Moreover, in the same chapter (of the Vedānta) there is another aphorism :—

(14) "For this very reason (the Vedas) are eternal." (*VDD.* 1.3.29)

This is to say that all men must believe the established fact, that the Vedas are self-authoritative and repositories of all sciences as they have been proclaimed by God and have also the eternal character (*nitya-dharma*). They (the Vedas) are eternal as they remain changeless and true through all the ages. No other (external) evidence is admissible (*svīkriyate*) to prove the authoritativeness of the Vedas. Other proofs are corroborative evidence (*sākṣī*). Like the Sun, the Vedas carry their own authority (with them). As the Sun, being Self-illuminated, illumines all objects in the world – both great and small—the mountains as well as the motes (*trasareṇu*) ; similarly the Vedas being illuminated by themselves, cast their light on all sciences.

---

(12) "शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ।" (*VDD.* I. 1.3)

(13) "ज्ञेयैकदेशार्थमपि स ततोऽप्यधिकतरविज्ञान इति सिद्धं लोके किमु वक्तव्यम् ।" (वेदान्तभाष्ये) (*VDD.*)

(14) "अत एव च नित्यत्वम् ।" (*VDD.* I. 3.29)

Hence, to prove His own existence, as it were, and also to establish the fact that the Vedas were revealed by Him, God reveals (the undermentioned *Mantra* as) authority :—

(15) "The Self-Born, Omnipresent (*Paribhū*) God overspreads all. He is entirely a Spirit with no corporeal form (*śukram-akāyam*) and (thus) woundless, tendenless and muscleless, Pure and Sinless. He is Omniscient (*kavi*), Inward Controller of all (*Manīṣī*), and the Ruler of all. He has from all eternity been teaching the true knowledge of things (through the revelation of the Vedas.)"

(*YV*. xxxx. 8)

The purport of the stanza is :—

God, as explained above, is omnipresent and pervades all things on all sides (*paryagāt=paritāḥ* i.e. all sides, *agāt* i.e. pervades). There is not a single atom wherein He does not exist. That Supreme Spirit (*Brahman*) is all energy (*śukra=vīrya*)* by which this whole universe is created and it

---

(15) "स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रणमस्नाविरँ शुद्धमपापविद्धम् । कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयम्भूः याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः ।" (*YV*. XXXX. 8)

* The word *Śukra* is explained by Yāska in the Nirukta (VIII. 12) as शुक्रं शोचतेः — ज्वलतिकर्मणः । In the Nighaṇṭu it is included in the list of words denoting Water. (I. 12)

This word can be derived from the root √*Śuc*+*rak* (नि० कुत्वम्). It has the following meaning :

(a) Bright, radiant, shining. cf. : शुक्रपेशसम् । (*Ṛg*. VIII. 6.8) Durgācārya says here, "शुक्रपेशसम् , शुक्ररूपाम् ।"

(b) White, pure.

(c) The planet Venus ; cf : "*Śukra-asta*."

(d) Name of the preceptor of *Asuras*.

(e) Name of *Agni*.

(f) Name of a plant called *Citraka*.

(g) Semen, Virile, cf :

"पुमान् पुंसोऽधिके शुक्रे ।
स्त्री भवत्यधिके स्त्रियाः ।" (*Manu*)

Our author takes this word here in the sense of "*vīrya*" i.e. semen and this here means 'God's creative energy'.

possesses eternal and mighty potency. He is free from the ties of the threefold body (*kaya*), the gross, the subtle and the causal. Even an atom (*paramāṇu*) cannot penetrate Him (lit. make hole in Him = *chidraṁ kartum*). Thus being impregnable He is woundless (*abraṇam*), He is free from all bounds of arteries or viens (*asnāviram*), hence boundless and unveiled. He is untouched by all defects e g. ignorance (*śuddham*). Sins cannot reach Him and His actions are never sinful (*apāpa-viddham*). He is Omniscient (*Kavi*)*. He

---

* *Kavi* : It is here an epithet of God. कविः √कु (शब्दे) + इ, (*U*. IV. 139) or √कव् (गत्यर्थे) + इण् कवि or √क्रमु (पादविक्षेपे) + इण् = कवि । Here we cite below a few lines from the Nirukta :—

(a) "मेधावी कविः । क्रान्तदर्शनो भवति । कवतेर्वा ।" (*N*. XII. 13)

(b) "कविः क्रान्तदर्शनः । अथवा कवतेः धातोः गत्यर्थस्य । कविः । कवति = गच्छत्यसौ नित्यम् । किञ्च-कवित्वादेव प्रासावीत्—प्रसुवति = जनयति ॥"
(*Durgācarya* XII. 13)

(c) "कवि कस्मात् ? क्रान्तदर्शन इत्यादि क्रमतेः । कवतेः वा गतिकर्मणः इदं रूपम् । क्रान्तं = दूरं गतं दर्शनं प्रकाशरूपं विज्ञानमस्य । यदा कवतेस्तदा कविः = गन्ता = गच्छत्यसौ नित्यम् । अवगन्ता वा सर्वस्य ज्ञाता । क्वचित्तु कवतेः = शब्दकर्मणः । अस्मिन् एव नामकरणे शब्दकारी कविरुच्यते ।"
(*Commentary of Skanda on Nirukta*)

Dayānanda has interpreted this word in the sense of "One who knows every thing i.e. Omniscient." This meaning is clearly accepted by Skandasvāmin in his previous quotation.

In the Vedic literature God is often described as *Kavi* i.e. the Poet and the Vedas as His immortal poems. cf :

(a) "अन्ति सन्तं न जहाति अन्ति सन्तं न मुञ्चति ।
पश्य देवस्य काव्यं न ममार न जीर्यते ॥" (*AV*, X. 8.32)

(b) "अग्निर्होता कविः क्रतुः ।" (*ṚV*. I. 1. 5)

(c) "कविं पुराणमनुशासितारम् ।" (*BG*. VIII. 9)

See Manu Smṛti (II. 4) also.

Manīṣī : The Inward Controller or the Knower of all minds. मनसः + ईषा (according to शकन्ध्वादिषु पररूपं वाच्यम् ॥ तच्च टेः । (*MB*) and the termination "*Ini*" ordained by (*P*. V. 2. 116) or √मनु (अवबोधने) + ईषन् (*U*. IV. 26) or "ईष् (गतौ) + टाप् = ईषा ; मनसः ईषा + इति" ॥ (*P*. III. 3. 103 ;
(Contd.)

knows as a pure witness (what transpires in the) minds of all (created beings) (*Manīṣī*). He is Over Lord of all i.e. Ruler of all (*Paribhū*). He is Self-Existent and is without the three causes e.g. the instrumental, the material and the general (*Svayambhū*). He is the Father of all – but of Him, the other generator there is none. By His own might He is ever present. God, the Supreme Self as described above is all Existence (*Sat*) all Consciousness (*Cit*) and all Bliss (*Ānanda*). He has been teaching the true knowledge of things to all His subjects (*samā-prajā*) through the revelation of the Vedas, in the beginning of creation. Whenever He creates the world, the gracious God reveals (lit. instructs) the Vedas, which contain all sciences for the benefit of all the created beings (*prajābhyaḥ*).

Hence, every body should admit that the Vedas are eternal. The Vedas are His knowledge. God's knowledge is always unchanged and uniform.

As it has been decided on the scriptural evidence that the Vedas are eternal ; so is true on reason also. For instance, 'something' cannot come out of 'nothing' and 'nothing' cannot produce 'something'. That thing alone which exists (at present) will remain in future. According to this maxim, the eternalness of the Vedas must be admitted. Because, a thing (i.e. a tree) which has no root, can never have branches. (To cherish contrary view, would be) like discerning the marriage of a sterile woman's son. If she has a son, she cannot be sterile. If she has no son, none can see his marriage. Similar view is also applicable here. If God does not possess eternal knowledge, how can He reveal knowledge to other ? If God does not impart knowledge (to mankind) no one would be able to attain knowledge and perception (*darśanam*). For, nothing can sprout, if it has no root. Nothing is seen in this world, which has come into existence without a cause. What we state here is (based upon) the actual and direct (*Sākṣāt-anubhava*) experience of all men. We retain impression of that thing alone which is

---

(Contd. from p. 51)

IV. 1.4). One who controls mind. The word *Gati* means 'ज्ञानं गमनं प्राप्तिश्चेति'. Hence, "the Knower of minds."

cf. : "येनकर्माण्यपसो मनीषिणः।" (*YV.*)

and also

"मनीषिणः सन्ति गृहेषु देवताः।" (*KS.* V)

or

"माननीयो मनीषिणाम्।" (*R.* I)

In the Vedic literature, it also indicates "a singer or praiser."

related to our direct cognition (*Pratyakṣa-anubhava*) and our memory and knowledge are due to these impressions. This alone causes (in us) inclination and aversion (to a thing). It cannot be otherwise. For instance, one who studies Sanskrit, he alone gets impression of this language and not of other and one who reads the Modern Indian language, retains impression of that language only and of no other. In this way, no one would have been able to acquire experience in any branch of knowledge, if God had not imparted instructions and teachings (to mankind) in the beginning of creation. In the absence of such experience, there can be no impression (*Saṃskāra*) and without impression, there can be no rememberance and without rememberance, there can be no knowledge or even the semblance of it.

Q. But how is it so ? Men have natural inclination towards actions. In their (natural) activities, they experience pleasure and pain. During the course of time gradually they will develop (their stock of) knowledge (*vidyā-vṛddhi*). Then why should we accept that the Vedas were revealed by God ?

A. Here we say. This has been refuted while discussing the origin of the Vedas. It has been decided there that even now no one can achieve knowledge or can develop it without getting instructions from others. Similarly there can be no progress in learning and knowledge if man does not recieve instructions from God in the form of the Vedas as already illustrated by (the example) of a child, kept (in forest) without instruction and (also by the example of) a forest-dweller. (It has been shown there) that such a child or the forester could neither achieve knowledge nor learn the use of human speach without instruction—then leave the question of acquiring knowledge (through experience). Hence, the knowledge contained in the Vedas which has come down to us from God is certainly eternal like all His attributes. The epithets, the attributes and the actions of an eternal substance must be eternal by themselves as their substratum itself is eternal. The name, the attributes and the actions have no independent existence : they need a seat or a substratum as they depend on some thing else (i.e. substratum). They are non-eternal, if their substratum is non-eternal. The eternal substance has no production or dissolution. Production signifies a specific combination of separate elements. Dissolution means separation of the caused products (into their component parts). It is (only) a negation of combination (*Saṅghāta-abhāva*). Dissolution is (the state of) imperception. God being changeless and uniform has not even a touch of combination or separation (*Saṃyoga-viyoga*).

Here we cite an aphorism from the sage Kaṇāda as an authority (in support of this proposition) :

(16) "The Eternal is that which Exists (*Sat*) and is uncaused (*Akāraṇa-vat*)." (*VD.* IV.4.1)

This means that an effect which has cause and exists is non-eternal as it did not exist before its production. The substance which is not an effect of (a cause) but always exists as cause of others is however called eternal. Whatever is caused by combination, postulates (the exsistence of) an agent or producer. If the producer is an effect of combination, he also has its producer and so on "*Ad infinitum.*" That, which itself is the result of combination, can possess no power of combining atoms in *Prakṛti*, as these atoms are subtler than itself. The subtler thing (i.e. atoms) is the *Ātmā* (i.e. pervader) of the grosser one, because the subtler can penetrate into the grosser thing as fire penetrates into iron. As fire because of its subtlety penetrates into hard and gross iron and separates its component parts from one another, similarly the water on account of its subtler character having entered into (gross) earth and its particles can combine them into a ball or disjoin them from one another. But these conjunctions and disjunctions cannot touch God who is All-Pervading. Consequently He has power to bring about conjunction and disjunction (i.e. creation and dissolution) according to the Law. This cannot be otherwise. As we, being within the range of (this Law of) conjunction and disjunction are powerless to combine or separate atoms in *Prakṛti* ; so would have been (the case) with God, if He also had been (within that sphere). He, from whom all combinations and separations proceed, is not under their control. Because He is the ultimate original cause of all conjunctions and disjunctions. The commencement of combination and dissolution is impossible without the Ultimate (First) cause.

As the Vedas have been revealed by and always exist in the knowledge of God, Who is the Ultimate (original First) cause of all conjunctions and disjunctions, Who is changeless by character, Who is unborn, without beginning and eternal and Who has perpetual power, their truthfulness of knowledge and eternity are established.

---

(16) "सदकारणवन्नित्यम् ॥" (*VD.* IV. 4.1)

THE CONTENTS OF THE VEDAS

The Vedas deal with the four (main) types of the subject matter e,g. (1) *Vijñāna** (i.e. realisation of knowledge), (2) *Karma* (i.e. action in general), (3) *Upāsanā* (i.e. communion with God) and (4) *Jñāna* (i.e. knowledge). Here, the first topic *viz Vijñāna* is the most imperative of all. It means the direct perception or realisation of all things—from God down to a—(blade of) grass. Here, also the realisation of God occupies the foremost rank as He is the primary theme of all the Vedas because God is the chief most and the highest of all the entities. We cite here the following pieces of evidence :

(1) "I tell thee briefly (*O Naciketas*) that "OM" is the only word, which all the Vedas repeatedly proclaim, for (whose attainment)

---

* The word *Vijñāna* has been translated by some scholars as, "Philosophy or Metaphysics" (Ghasi Ram). But it is wrong. Dayānada himself explains it as :

"परमेश्वरादारभ्य तृणपर्यन्तपदार्थेषु बोधान्वयात् ।"

According to this statement *Vijñāna* means "realisation of knowledge." The word *Vijñāna* is explained by Apte in the following manner :

(I) Knowledge, wisdom, intelligence (*PT*. I. 24 and V. 3) cf. : "*Vijñāna* + *Maya-Koşa*."

(II) Discrimination.

(III) Skill, Proficiency, (*Prayoga-Vijñāna*). (*S*. I. 2)

(IV) Worldly knowledge or knowledge derived from worldly experience (opposed to *Jñāna* which is knowledge of *Brahman* ; "ज्ञानं चेदं सविज्ञानमिह वक्ष्याम्यशेषत:" । (*BG*. VII. 2, 3. 41). The whole Seventh Chapter of Gitā explains this.

But our author takes us to the stage which is the ultimate goal of human knowledge i.e. the knowledge of the Supreme Soul.

(1) "सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति,
तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद् वदन्ति ।
यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति
तत्ते पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीम्योमित्येत् ।" (*KTU*. II. 15)

all peanances are observed and desirous of what they lead a life of celibacy (*Brahmacarya*)." (*KTU*. II.15)

(2) "The sacred syllable *OM* denotes Him." (*YD*. I. 1. 27)

(3) "*OM* is (*the name of*) Omnipresent God." (*YV*. XXXX. 17)

(4) "*OM* is (*the designation of*) Brahman." (*TĀ*. VII. 8)

(5) "(There are two types of knowledge (*Vidyā*). One is *Aparā* i.e. the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, the Sāmadeva, the Atharvaveda, Śikṣā (Phonetics), Kalpa (i.e. Ritual science), Grammer, Etymology, Metrics and Astronomy.

Now the *Parā* is that by which that Imperishable (*Akṣara*) is apprehended.

Men of resolute wisdom discern Him ; who is invisible, incapable of being grasped or comprehended, having no family or caste (*Agotram. Avarṇam*), without organs of sight and hearing, without hands and feet, eternal, all pervading, omnipresent, the most subtle, immutable and the origin of all beings."

(*MUU*. I. 5. 6)

All these citations mean that—"O Naciketas, (*Sarve Vedas*) the highest seat or stage which is called Final Emancipation (*Mokṣa*) to be obtained by the realisation of the Supreme Soul, is *OM* (i.e. communion with God). It is all bliss and free from all pains. *Praṇava* i.e. the syllable *OM* denotes Him and God is its expressed significance (*Vācya*). *OM* is the name of God. All the Vedas have, Brahman—the Most High (*Mukhya Pratipādya*) as their chief topic. The word *Āmanati* is from the root √*Mnā* (to practise) with prefix 'Ā'. (*Tapānsi* etc.) All austerities and righteous deeds pertain to His realisation. (*Yat Icchantaḥ*). Here the word "*Brahmacarya*" implies (*Upalakṣaṇa*) all the four stages of human life e.g. the life of a religious student as well as those of a house-holder, an ascetic and a teacher who has renounced the world. The object of all these practices is the attainment of Brahman.

---

(2) "तस्य वाचकः प्रणवः ।" (*YD*. I. 1. 27)

(3) "ओ३म् खं ब्रह्म । (*YA*. XXXX. 17)

(4) "ओमिति ब्रह्म ।" (*TA*. VII. 8)

(5) "तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्ववेदः शिक्षा कल्पो व्याकरणं निरुक्तं छन्दो ज्योतिषमिति । अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते ॥१॥ तत्तदद्रश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्णम-चक्षुःश्रोत्रं तदपाणिपादं नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मं तदव्ययं यद् भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः ॥२॥" (*MUU*. I. 5. 6).

The learned, desire to have an access to Him by concentrating (their mind) upon Him and variously proclaim (His glory). I. Yama, O Naciketas, tell thee briefly that seat is this Brahman.

There are two kinds of *Vidyā* (i.e. knowledge) in the Vedas-"*Aparā* and *Parā*". That *Vidyā* or knowledge by which we know precisely all (material) things—from earth and a blade of grass to *Prakṛti*, and understand their right use, is called *Aparā* and that by which one knows Brahman, Who is Omnipotent and Invisible etc. is styled as *Parā*. It is also inferred that *Parā* is higher than *Aparā*.

Moreover, (the following stanza supports this view) :

(6) The learned always turn their eyes to the lofty place of *Viṣṇu* (i.e. *Mokṣa*), spread like an eye in the *Dyaus* (i.e. luminous region)." (*RV*. I. 22.20)

---

(6) "तद् विष्णोः परमं पदम् सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः ।
दिवीव चक्षुराततम् ।" (*RV*. I. 22. 20)

The above English rendering of the stanza is mine. According to Dayānanda it can be translated as follows :

> "The learned look forward at all times for that Supreme seat (*Parama Padam*) of *Viṣṇu* (*called Mokṣa*) (who pervades all space) as the eye pervades the solar light (i.e. the space filled by the Sun's rays)." (*RV*. I. 22.20)

Here the author has translated the word *Pada* (i.e. seat) as *Mokṣa*. *Mokṣa* is called a seat or a stage, because it is obtained by communion with God at the end of human life. The word *Pada* is derived from the root √*Pad* i.e. *Padanīyam* or *Prāpaṇīyam*, i.e. a seat or stage which is to be obtained by the learned.

Author means to say that this final emancipation is nothing but the attainment of God. Hence it is described here as "*Paramam Padam* of *Viṣṇu*". This *Mokṣa* is again described as "*Ātatam*" as the Final Emancipation is not limited by space or time. It can be achieved by all devotees every where and always because God is *Viṣṇu* (i.e. all pervading).

The word *Pada* is used in Sanskrit to denote this meaning (*Sthāna-Padavī*) also. (*Pada*= √*Pad*+*Ac*). I cite below a few extracts from the classical literature where this word *Pada* means a rank or position or place or station :

(a) "अधोऽधः पदम् ।" (*NS*. X)

(b) "भगवत्या प्राश्निकस्य पदमध्यासितव्यम् ।" (*MM*. I) (Contd.)

This means that the learned (*Sūris*) see at all times that highest seat of all pervading God (*Viṣṇu*) which is called Final Emancipation (*Mokṣa*) and which is obtained by all men by adopting all the best possible means, and it is absolutely all bliss. It extends to all places i.e. it is not restricted by space, time and by any other matter. As God is all pervading (*Viṣṇu*) by His character. His seat is obtainable by all at all places, Here the simile is given that as the sphere of the eye-sight is (the entire) space filled by the solar light so (devotees are capable of achieving that seat of *Mokṣa* every where as God exists at all places). *Mokṣa* being the highest possible object of human desire, the wise aspire to obtain it. Hence, the Vedas accord a special treatment to it.

Vyāsa also offers an aphorism on this topic in his Vedānta Sūtras :

(7) "He (Brahman) is the Theme (of the Vedas) because the applicability (of the text lies in Him)." (*VD* I. 1.4)

Here the idea is that God is regularly explained by the Vedas, at some places by indirect expressions and at others by indication or suggestion (*Paramparayā*).

Hence, God is the ultimate theme of the Vedas.

This can further be supported by (the following *stanza* from) the Yajurveda :

(Contd. from p. 57)

(c) "यान्त्येवं गृहिणीपदं युवतयः ।" (*S*. IV. 17)

(d) "श्लाघ्ये स्थिता गृहिणीपदे ।" (*S*. IV. 18)

(e) "सतां हि सन्देहपदेषु वस्तुषु ।" (*S*. I. 22)

(f) अपदे शङ्कितोऽस्मि ।" (*MK*. I)

(g) Please see also :

DK. 162 ; *KUS*. VI. 72, III. 4 and *R*. II. 50, XI. 82.

(7) "तत्तु समन्वयात्" । (*VD*. I. 1.4)

Here "*Samanvaya*" means "applicability". cf :

"न च सङ्गतानां पदानां ब्रह्मस्वरूपविषये निश्चिते समन्वयेऽर्थान्तरकल्पना युक्ता ।" (*Śārīrika Bhāṣya*)

(8) "That Supreme Being, than Whom no other and greater is born, Who penetrates the whole universe and Who, being the Lord of creatures, remains and sports with them, creates and (gives luster to) the three luminaries (the Sun, fire and electricity). From Him originate the sixteen digits*, which He unites with created beings." (*YV*. VIII. 36)

This is to say that no other superior object exists to Supreme Being (*Para Brahman*). *Prajāpati* is a name of God as He is the main-stay of all creatures. He (*Prajāpati* i.e. the Lord of created beings) pervades (*Āviveśa*) all the regions. Being the Bestower of Supreme Bliss on all beings He has filled and illumined all the worlds with three lights—the Sun, the fire and electricity. He has generated the sixteen *Kalās* i.e. digits or they exist in Him. Hence He is called *Ṣoḍaśī*.

---

(8) "यस्मान्न जात: परो अन्यो अस्ति
य आविवेश भुवनानि विश्वा ।
प्रजापति: प्रजया सꣳ रराण:
त्रीणि ज्योतींषि सचते स षोडशी ॥" (*YV*. VIII. 36)

This verse may be translated as :

"Than whom there is none other born more mighty,
Who hath pervaded all existing creatures-
Prajāpati, rejoicing in his off-springs, he
Ṣoḍaśī, maintains the three great lustres." (*Griffith*)

Here three lustres may mean Agni, Vāyu, Sūrya or Fire, wind, Sun or Fire, lightening and Sun.

* The sixteen digits (*Ṣoḍaśī Kalās*) are enumerated to Sukeśa by Pippalāda as follows :

"इहैवान्त: शरीरे सौम्य ! स: पुरुषो यस्मिन्नेता: षोडश कला: प्रभवन्ति । स प्राणमसृजत् । प्राणात् श्रद्धां खं वायुं ज्योतिराप: पृथिवीमिन्द्रियं मन: अन्नम् । अन्नाद् वीर्यं तपो मन्त्रा: कर्म लोका लोकेषु नाम च ।" (*PU*. VI. 2.4)

i.e. "To him he then said : 'Even here within the body, O friend, is that Person in whom they say the sixteen parts arise.

He created life (*Prāṇa*) ; from life, faith (*Śraddhā*), ether, wind, light, water, earth, sense-faculty (*Indriya*), mind, food ; from food, virility, austerity, the Vedas, action, place and name." (*PU*. VI. 2.4)

God is, therefore, the supreme object of the Vedas. The Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad also states :

(9) "*OM* is an immortal syallable and this entire (*world*) is His manifestation." (*MUU*. I. 1)

This means : He is *Akṣara* whose name is *OM*. That Brahman is called *Akṣara* because He never perishes and also because He pervades the movable and immovable world. All the Vedas and the Scriptures and also the entire creation chiefly explain Him. Hence He must be accpted as the basic theme (of the Vedas).

Moreover, it is not logical to prefer secondary sense to the primary one ; because it is in accordance with the authoritative dictum of the *Mahā-bhāṣya*, the grammatical commentary that "the accomplishment of an action with the help of primary sense should be preferred where both—primary as well as secondary—meanings are available."*

Accordingly we should give preference to the primary meaning i.e. God while interpreting the Vedas because the chief object of the Vedic teaching is the attainment of God.

All men, therefore, should follow the Vedic instructions and append their activities (in the realm of Action, Meditation and Knowledge—*Dharma, Upāsanā, Jñāna*) with glorification of God so that they may attain success and accomplishment in (material and spiritual) matters concerning this life or life after death by doing good to others according to their capacity.

The second subject-matter (of the Vedas) is called *Karma-Kāṇḍa* (i.e. topic of action). It is entirely full of (various) activities. Without this, learning or knowledge would remain incomplete ; because the internal or mental activities are closely related to the external or physical functions. This *Karma-Kāṇḍa* (i.e. department of action) is multifold. But its chief varieties are only two. One aims at the accomplishment of the supreme object of human existence i.e. the achievement of *Mokṣa* through the performance of God's praise, prayer and meditation, obedience and resignation to His will, righteous deeds and knowledge.

The other type of action is undertaken with a view to acquire riches and secure enjoyments by performing righteous deeds and thus to accomplish

---

(9) "ओमित्येतदक्षरम् । इदं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानम् ।" (*MUU*. I. 1)

* "प्रधानाप्रधानयोः प्रधाने कार्यसम्प्रत्ययः ।" (*MB*)

success in the worldly affairs. When action is performed with the absolute object of obtaing God, it is called *Niṣkāma* (i.e. desireless or disattached action) and it has the noblest yield as it is endowed with eternal bliss. When it is performed with the sole object of securing wealth and enjoyment, resulting in worldly pleasure, it is styled as *Sakāma* (i.e. an action attached to worldly desire) ; because it is mingled with the tasting of the birth and death. In the first category are included the activities of (various) sacrifices (*yajñas*)—from the *Agnihotra* to the *Aśvamedha*—where one has to offer oblations (consisted of) ingredients, duly refined and clarified which contain fragrant, sweet, tonic and curative properties, into the fire, for the purification of air and the rain-water. Such sacrifices (*Yajñas*) bring happiness to the whole world.

In the second category, are included such actions as the procurement of food-stuffs, cloth and manufacture of conveyances, machines, tools and implements etc. which are performed for the accomplishment of the regulated social order. Mostly these actions result in personal and individual joys only.

Here we are supported by (the following) evidence from the Pūrva Mīmānsā :

(10) "As ingredients, their purificatory measures and the actions (in the sacrifices) are for the benefit of all others, statements asserting certain objects are only explanatory or laudatory ones," (*MD.* IV. 3.1)

(11) "The purificatory process for ingredients which are only for (sacrificial) activities, results in qualitative performance of the sacrifice (*Kratu-Dharma*)." (*MD.* IV. 3.8)

---

(10) "द्रव्यसंस्कारकर्मसु परार्थत्वात् फलश्रुतिरर्थवादः स्यात्" । (*MD.* IV. 3.1)

(11) "द्रव्याणां तु क्रियार्थानां संस्कारः क्रतु-धर्मः स्यात् ।" (*MD.* IV. 3.8)

Here the word "*Arthavāda*" is very technical. The word "*Artha*" means : "object, purpose, wealth, context or substance". The "*Arthavāda*" denotes the following meanings :

(a) Declaration of any purpose.

(b) Affirmation, declaratory assertion, an explanatory remark, speech or assertion having a certain object, a sentence.

It often recommends a *Vidhi* or a precept by stating the good arising from its proper observance and the evils arising from its omission, and also by adducing historical instances in its support. (Contd.)

The import of these aphorisms is that the duty of the performer of a Sacrifice (*Yajña*) is three-fold, e.g. the procurement of ingredients, their purification (*saṃskāra*) and the actual performance (*karma*). The above mentioned ingredients are of four kinds i.e. (I) fragrant (II) sweet (III) tonic and (IV) curative. The purificatory process relating to them (ingredients) must be adopted for the accomplishment of the best and meritorious results. For instance, with a view to prepare a good soup or sauce (*sūpa*=*sū* + *pa*+ *ka* in the sense of *ghañ*) fragrant ghee is poured into a ladle (lit. spon) and fried upon the fire till it emits smoke ; the ladle is thrust into the kettle containing the soup or curry and opening of the vessel is closed and the soup is moved about with it. Then the smoke like vapour arises before which being as condensed as fragrant liquid and mixing with the entire soup makes it nutritious, delicious and sweet-smelling. Similarly, vapours arising from a *Yajña* purify the atmosphere (lit. air) and the rain-water. Thus it is for the good of the whole world. Hence it has been stated in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa :

(Contd. from p. 61)

cf : "स्तुतिनिन्दापरकृतिपुराकल्प इत्यर्थवादः ।" (*ND.*)
"प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्य तत्र तत्र प्रशंसनमर्थवादः ।"

According to Laugaki, it is of three kinds :

"गुणवादः विरोधे स्यात् अनुवादोऽवधारिते ।"
भूतार्थवादस्तद्धानात् अर्थवादस्त्रिधा मतः ।"

Here the last kind includes many varieties.

(c) One of the six means of finding out the "*Tatparya*" (real aim and object) of any work.

(d) Praise or eulogy.

cf : "अर्थवाद एषः । दोषं तु मे कंचित् कथय ।" (*URC.* I)

Our author interprets these Sūtras as "फलस्य श्रुतिः श्रवणं हि अर्थवादोऽनर्थनिवारणाय भवति ।" which is not very clear. The word *Artha-vāda* has been explained by us above. According to Dayānanda, no specific purpose or object can be attributed to any *Yajña.* The real object of such performances is the benefit of the whole universe. Hence *Yajñas* are included by our author in *Niṣkāma* actions (i.e. actions detatched from desire). He is always original in his laudable interpretations.

(12) "A *Yajña*, which is performed by a learned man in the prescribed manner, conduces (to the happiness) of all mankind (*janatā*)."

(*AB.* I. 2)

Here "*janatā*" (i.e. mankind) means all men (without any distinction). The *Yajña* brings happiness to all men alike if a learned performer consumes duly purified ingredients in fire in the aforesaid manner. As it aims only at others' benefit, *Yajña* results in the universal good. Hence statements indicating specific aims are merely laudatory ones. The real object (of a *Yajña*) is to ward off evils.

The purity of the peforming people and the refinement of ingredients used in sacrificial performances should be taken as "*Kratu-Dharma*" (i.e. essentials of *Yajñas*). Sacred and beneficial results (*dharmas*) are brought forth only in this very manner and not otherwise (from a *Yajña*).

It is supported by the following evidence :

(13) "Smoke or vapours are produced from fire, from smoke, the clouds ; from clouds, the rain or (in short) from fire all these things are produced. Hence, they are called as *Tapojās* (i.e. born of heat or fire). (*SB.* V. 3)

The import is that from fire, smoke and vapour are brought forth. When this fire penetrates into trees, medicinal herbs, water and other substances and disintegrates the solid objects, it separates juice from them. These (juices) then reduced to levity and being borne up by the air soar up to the sky. The liquid part therein is called vapour and the hard substance is earthly one. The smoke, therefore, is the name given to the combination of both the particles. When such a smoke reaches the higher regions, and thus watery vapours grow in abundance there, it produces clouds. From these masses of clouds in the air, the rain begins to fall. Hence from fire alone (*Agneḥ-eva*) are generated all herbs and plants like barley. From them is produced food, from food, semen and from semen the bodies (of all living being).

---

(12) "यज्ञोऽपि तस्यै जनतायै कल्पते यत्रैवं विद्वान् होता भवति ।" (*AB.* I. 2)

(13) "अग्नेर्वै धूमो जायते, धूमादभ्रमभ्राद् वृष्टिः । अग्नेर्वा एता जायन्ते । तस्मात् आह तपोजा इति ।" (*SB.* V. 3)

The same subject has been stated in the *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad* :

(14) "From that Soul (*Ātman*), varily ether (or space-*ākāśa*) arose, from ether, wind ; from wind, fire ; from fire, water ; from water, the earth ; from the earth, herbs ; from herbs, food ; from food, semen ; from semen, the person (*Puruṣa*).

This, verily, is the person that consists of the essence of food." (*TU*. I. 2.)

(15) "He performed austerity (*Tapas*). Having performed austerity he understood that Brahman is food. For truly, indeed, beings here are born from food, when born, they live by food, on deceasing, they enter into food." (*TU*. II. 3.)

Here food is called 'Brahman' (the great) as it is the chief cause of (the continuance of) life. All living beings draw happiness from pure food, water and air and not if they are impure.

There are two kinds of efforts (for the purification of all these things). One is 'Divine' and the other 'human'. God has created this fiery (orb of) the Sun, sweet fragrance and the flowers. The Sun is ceaselessly busy in drawing up juices from (all things) in the world. But as the fragrant and bad smelling qualities are mixed up with these juices, the water and air that come into contact with them. are, because of this combination of sweet and bad odour, rendered into an indifferent quality where there are both desirable as well as undesirable elements. Consequently the quality of plants, food, seed and bodies also becomes comparatively inferior because they are produced from such a rain water. Because of their middling quality, (all human) virtues e.g. strength, intellect, valour, prowess, perseverance, bravery grow mediocre. Because it is a philosophical doctrine that as is the cause so is the effect.

For this we cannot blame the Divine creation. Because bad smell and other defects are man-made and should be ascribed to human creation. As man is the author of bad odour and other defects, it is, therefore, obligatory for him to remove them. It is a divine ordinance that one ought to speak the truth and ought not to tell lies. He, who transgresses it, becomes a sinner and suffers afflictions in accordance with the law and order

---

(14) "तस्माद्वा एतस्मात् आत्मन आकाशः सम्भूत आकाशात्" वायुः वायोरग्निः, अग्नेरापः, अद्भ्यः पृथिवी पृथिव्या ओषधयः, ओषधिभ्योऽन्नमन्नाद् रेतः, रेतसः पुरुषः । स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः ।" (ब्रह्मानन्दवल्ली 2) (*TU*. I. 2)

(15) "स तपोऽतप्यत । तपस्तप्त्वा अन्नं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । अन्नात् ह्येव खलु इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । अन्नेन जातानि जीवन्ति । अन्नं प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति ।" (*TU*. II. 3)

of God. Similarly God has ordained that man ought to perform a *Yajña.* Whoever violates this, commits sin and suffers pain, because he omits an action of universal good.

The greater the number of men and other animals gathered together at one particular place, the greater is the amount of bad smell. God's creation is not its cause. Because it is a result of crowding together of a huge number of men and other animals. Sometimes men for their own pleasure, accumulate elephants and other animals at one particular place and the excessively offensive smell, caused by this must be ascribed to men's pleasure-seeking-activities. In this manner, the entire bad odour which pollutes the air and the rain-water is caused by human agency. Hence it becomes obligatory for men that they should remove it also.

Of all living beings men alone can discriminate between the good and the evil (lit. benefit and harm). Thinking or realisation (*Vicāra* or *Manana*) is the characteristic of a man's manhood.*

Of all embodied living beings, God has created men alone who possess mind (*Manasvin* i.e. having mind) and thus have the capacity of discrimination. By a particular combination of atoms (*Paramāṇu-saṃyoga*) He has created human organs ; which have the capacity of acquiring knowledge (lit. abode of knowledge). Hence men alone and no other animals have power of discrimination between good and evil (*Dharma* and *Adharma*) and of doing righteous and leaving unrighteous actions.

That is why all men should perform *Yajñas* for universal benefit.†

---

* Author says : **"मननं-विचारस्तद्-योगात् मनुष्य:" ।**

Here the following explanation of the word *'Manuṣya'* given by Yāska deserves notice :—

"मनुष्या: कस्मात् ? मत्वा कर्माणि सीव्यन्ति । मनस्यमानेन सृष्टा: । मनस्यति: पुनर्मनस्वीभावे । मनोरपत्यम् । मनुष्यो वा ।" (*N.* II. 3)

† Ṛṣi Dayānanda in emphatic terms makes it clear that *"Yajña"* is an obligatory act on the part of a man. A man must perform sacrifice for universal advantage. It has no selfish end. The word *"Yajña"* is from the root *'√yaj'* to sacrifice, to worship with sacrifice.

The Bhagavad-Gītā clearly states that performance of a *Yajña* is essential and unavoidable :— (Contd.)

(Contd. from page 65)

cf : "सहयज्ञाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा पुरोवाच प्रजापतिः ।
अनेन प्रसविष्यध्वमेष वोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक् ॥१॥
यज्ञशिष्टाशिनः सन्तो मुच्यन्ते सर्वकिल्बिषैः ।
भुञ्जते ते त्वघं पापा ये पचन्त्यात्मकारणात् ॥२॥
कर्मब्रह्मोद्भवं विद्धि ब्रह्माक्षरसमुद्भवम् ।
तस्मात् सर्वगतं ब्रह्म नित्यं यज्ञे प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥३॥" (*BG.* III)

i.e. "In ancient days, Brahmadeva created living beings together with *Yajña* and said to them : "By means of this (*Yajña*) may you grow, may this be to you a "*Kāma-dhenu*" (i.e. something which fulfils all desires). (1)

"Those good men, who part-take of what remains after the performance of the *Yajña*, are redeemed from all sins. But those, who (without performing the *Yajña*) cook (food) for themselves only, such sinful persons eat only sin. (2)

"Know (that) the origin of Action is from the Brahma (that is, the Vedas) and this Brahma (the Vedas) has sprung out of the Brahman (God) ; therefore (know that) the All-Pervading Brahman is always 'primarily worshipped' in the "*Yajña*"." (*BG* III)

Lord Krishṇa condemns a man who wastes his life without performing *Yajñas* for universal benefit :—

"एवं प्रवर्तितं चक्रं नानुवर्त्तयतीह यः ।
अघायुरिन्द्रियारामो मोघं पार्थ स जीवति ॥" (*BG.* III)

i.e. "The life of that man who does not move the cycle (of action) which has thus been started (for the maintenance of the world) is sinful ; and the existence of this slave of the senses, O Arjuna, is worthless." (*BG.* III)

A *Yajña* must be performed without any personal desire. In the *Māhabhārata* we read :—

"त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धा यज्ञोऽध्ययनं दानमिति ।
यज्ञो यष्टव्य इत्येव यो यजत्यफलेप्सया ॥" (*MB. Śānti*)

(Contd.)

(Contd. from page 66)

"*Yajña* is an act which is done with no selfish motive."

(*MB. Śānti*)

The undermentioned citations from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* may be read with benefit :—

(a) "त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धा यज्ञोऽध्ययनं दानमिति ।" (*CHU.* II. 23.1)

(b) "यदेष यन्निदं सर्वं पुनाति तस्मादेष यज्ञः ।" (*CHU.* IV. 16.1)

The universal character of *Yajña* is eulogised in our ancient literature. All beneficial activities e.g. patriotism, devotion to God, attainment of knowledge for others' benefit, life of celibacy, harmlessness to others, development of social order, protection of orphans and shelterless people are included in this *Yajña.* The following extracts from authoritative books will establish this fact beyond doubt :—

(a) "यद् यज्ञ इत्याचक्षते ब्रह्मचर्यमेव तत् ।" (*CHU.* VIII. 5.1)

(b) "त्वं ब्रह्मा त्वं यज्ञः ।" (*BU.* I. 5.17)

(c) "अहं ब्रह्मा अहं यज्ञः ।" (*KTU.* II)

(d) "अहं क्रतुरहं यज्ञः ।" (*BG.* IX. 16)

(e) "विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते ।" (*TU.* II. 5.1)

(f) "यज्ञो विष्णुः प्रजापतिः ।" (*MTU.* VI. 16)

(g) "यज्ञेन देवा दिवं गताः ।" (*MBNU.* XXI. 2)

The selfless person perceives a Sacrifice (*Yajña*) going on within himself :—

(i) "स्वशरीरे यज्ञं परिवर्त्तयामि ।" (*PNU.* II)

(ii) "शरीरं यज्ञः ।" (*MNU.* XX. 12)

(iii) "वाग्वै यज्ञस्य होता । चक्षुर्वै यज्ञस्य अध्वर्युः । प्राणो वै यज्ञस्य उद्गाता । मनो वै यज्ञस्य ब्रह्मा ।" (*BU.* III. 1.1-6)

(iv) "तस्यैवं विदुषो यज्ञस्यात्मा यजमानः, श्रद्धा पत्नी, शरीरमिध्ममुरो वेदिः, लोमानि बर्हिः, वेदः शिखा, हृदयं यूपः, काम आज्यं, मन्युः पशुः, तपोऽग्निः, दमः शमयिता, दक्षिणा वाक् होता, प्राण उद्गाता, चक्षुरध्वर्युः, मनो ब्रह्मा, श्रोत्रमग्नीद् यावत् ध्रियते सा दीक्षा, यदश्नाति तद् हविः, यत् पिबति तदस्य सोमपानम् ।" (*MNU.* LXXX.) (Contd.)

(Contd. from page 67)

Human body is described as the hermitage of "Seven Sages" who perform sacrifices :—

"सप्त ऋषयः प्रतिहृताः शरीरे सप्त रक्षन्ति सदमप्रमादम् ।"

(*BU* ; *YV*. XXXIV. 55)

According to the Bhagavad-Gītā God created men with sacrifice :–

"सह यज्ञाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा पुरोवाच प्रजापतिः ।" (*BG*. III. 10)

The universal aspect of a *Yajna* is highly praised in the Vedic literature also :—

(I) "अध्वरो वै यज्ञः ।" (*SB*. I. 2.4.5 ; I. 4.1.38)

(II) "यज्ञो वै नमः ।" (*YV*. XIII. 8 ; *SB*. VII. 4 1.30)

(III) "यज्ञो वै भुज्युः ।" (*YV*. XVIII, 42)

(IV) "यज्ञो वै सर्वाणि भूतानि भुनक्ति ।" (*SB*. IX. 4.1.11)

(V) "यज्ञो भगः ।" (*YV*. XI. 7)

(VI) "यज्ञो वा ऋतस्य योनिः ।" (*YV*. XI. 6)

(VII) "यज्ञो वै महिमा ।" (*YV*. XI. 6 ; *SB*. VI. 3.1.18)

(VIII) "यज्ञो वै स्वः ।" (*YV*. I. 11)

(IX) "यज्ञो वै सुम्नाम् ।" (*YV*. XII. 67)

(X) "यज्ञो वै श्रेष्ठतमं कर्म ।" (*YV*. I. 5 ; *SB*. I. 7.1.5)

(XI) "यज्ञो वै विशो यज्ञे हि सर्वाणि भूतानि विशन्ति ।" (*SB*. VIII. 7.3)

(XII) "यज्ञो वै भुवनस्य नाभिः ।" (*TB*. III. 9.5.5)

(XIII) "यज्ञो वा अवति ।" (*TB*. VI. 4.5)

The selfish people (i.e. non-sacrificers are condemned in the following stanza :—

"अयज्वानः सनकाः प्रेतिमीयुः ।" (*RV*. X. 33.4)

i.e. "Even the charitable people who have no sacrificial activities go to ruin." cf :—

(XIV) पराचिच्छीर्षाः ववृजुस्त इन्द्राऽयज्वानो यज्वभिः स्पर्धमानाः ।" (*RV*. I. 33.5)

(XV) "प्रास्य पारं नवति नाव्यानामपि कर्त्तमवर्त्तयोऽयज्यून् ।" (*RV*. I. 121.13)

(XVI) "अयज्ञियो हतवर्चा भवति ।।" (*AV*. XII. 2 37)

Thus an "*A-yajvā*" is depricated in harsh terms, Ancient Aryans were known for their selfless charitable outlook towards all living beings.

(Contd.)

Q. How can it rightly be said that a *Yajña* is performed for others' benefit ; when the fragrant substances e.g. musk etc. are reduced to ashes by being thrown into fire ? These good things can serve more beneficial purpose, if they are given to men etc. to eat and be utilized otherwise, than being burnt in sacrificial fire. Then what is the advantage of performing a *Yajña* ?

A. Here we say that nothing is ever utterly perishable. Annihilation (*vināśa*) means merely the passing of an object from perceptible state into an imperceptible one.*

Q. How many kinds of perception do you accept ?

A. I admit eight types of cognition (*Darśana*).

Q. What are they ?

A. I accept (the following) eight means of cognition (e.g. :—(1) Sense Perception (*Pratyakṣa*), (2) Inference (*Anumāna*), (3) Analogy (*Upamāna*), (4) Verbal Evidence (*Śabda*), (5) Tradition (*Aitihya*), (6) Circumstantial Implication (*Arthāpatti*), (7) Probability (*Sambhava*), (8) Non-existence (*Abhāva*).)

Ācārya Gautama in his *Nyāya Sūtra* defines them as follows :—

(16) "Sense perception (*Pratyakṣa*) is that truly unerring and determined knowledge which is derived from the contact of a sense organ with its object." (*ND.* I. 1.4)

(Contd. from page 68)

Dayānanda here stresses upon the fact that *Yajña* is performed only for universal benefit. We have quoted here a good number of instances showing the importance of a *Yajña*. The interested reader may see (*RV*. II. 26.1 ; VII. 6.3 ; VIII. 70.11 ; and *AV*. XI. 2.23 ; and also Nirukta X. 26; *RV*. X. 81.5). Instances can be multiplied. We have, due to economy of space, not given here the English renderings of these citations which are quite simple and lucid.

* cf. "अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत ।
अव्यक्तनिधनान्येव तत्र का परिदेवना ॥" (*BG*. II. 28)

(16) "इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानमव्यपदेश्यमव्यभिचारि व्यवसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम् ।" (*ND*. I. 1.4)

(17) "Now the Inference (*Anumāna*) which is based on Sense-Perception is three-fold : (I) *Pūrva-vat* (Inference of the effect from the cause), (II) *Śeṣa-vat* (i.e. Inference of cause from the effect), (III) *Sāmānyato-dṛṣṭa*) (i.e. an Inference neither deduced from the relation of cause to the effect nor from that of effect to the cause." (*ND.* I. 1.5)

(18) "To establish fact on its resemblance to another object is called Analogy i.e. *Upamāna*." (*ND.* I. 1.6)

(19) "The authoritative instruction is called *Śabda* (i.e. Verbal Evidence)." (*ND.* I. 1.7)

According to this I accept the eight types of Cognition. Here the *Pratyakṣa* is that true and invariably precise knowledge, which is deduced from the contact of sense-organs with their objects. For example, by looking at from close quarter (we get right cognition) that he is a human being and nothing else. The inference based on cause and effect is *Anumāna*. For example on seeing the son it is concluded that he had a father. Knowledge based on similarity is called *Upamāna*. For example, *Deva Datta* resembles *Yajña Datta*. This instruction is based on analogy. By *Śabda* (i.e. Verbal Authority) the conviction regarding the seen or unseen objects is obtained. For example, "the statement that salvation is obtained by knowledge."

(Gautama again says in his *NyāyaSūtra*) as :—

(20) "Not four only. The *Aitihya* (Tradition), *Arthāpatti* (Presumption), *Sambhava* (Probability), and *Abhāva* (Non-existence) are also (means of) cognition." (*ND.* II. 2. 1)

(21) "*Śabda* includes *Aitihya* ; and *Anumāna* includes *Arthāpatti*, *Sambhava* and *Abhāva*." (*ND.* II. 2. 2)

These two aphorisms are briefly explained here. The *Aitihya* (Tradition) is accepted only when it is supported by Verbal Evidence from a

---

(17) "अथ तत्पूर्वकं त्रिविधमनुमानं पूर्ववत् शेषवत् सामान्यतोदृष्टं च ॥" (*ND.* I. 1.5)

(18) "प्रसिद्धसाधर्म्यात् साध्यसाधनमुपमानम् ।" (*ND.* I. 1.6)

(19) "आप्तोपदेश: शब्द: ।" (*ND.* I. 1.7)

(20) "न चतुष्ट्वम्—ऐतिह्यार्थापत्तिसम्भवाभावप्रामाण्यात् ।" (*ND.* II. 2.1)

(21) "शब्द ऐतिह्यानर्थान्तरभावाद् अनुमानेऽर्थापत्तिसम्भवाभावानर्थान्तरभावाच्चाप्रतिषेध: ।" (*ND.* II. 2.2)

trust worthy person. For instance, "there was a war between *Devas* and *Asuras*". *Arthāpatti* is the Circumstantial Presumption. For instance, the statement that "the rain falls when there are clouds" conveys indirectly that "it does not rain when there are no clouds". *Sambhava* means possibility of a thing by some mean or at a particular place. For example, the statement that "parents beget off-springs" is a possible one. But if some one says that the hair of moustache of Kumbhakaraṇa stood erect four Kośas and the length of his nose was 16 Kośas, (he cannot be relied upon) because of his impossible and consequently false statement. Abhāva is Non-existence of an object at particular place and time. Some one asks a person to bring a pitcher. When he does not perceive the pitcher there, he gets cognition that the pitcher is not there by means of Non-existence (*Abhāva*). He fetches it from the place where it exists.

This is a concise explanation of *Pratyakṣa* etc.

In this manner I accept eight sources of Cognition. Without accepting them, none can achieve success in the affairs of this world and of the next world.

(Imagine) some one thoroughly reduces a clod of earth to powder and throws it up high into the sky with the might of his arm in a violent wind. Here destruction (*nāśa*) of the clod is not (actual but) a figurative one (*Upacaryate*) because the clod has become only imperceptible to the eyes (and has not actually ceased to exist). The word "*nāśa*" is derived from the root '√*Naś*' to become invisible with suffix (*ghañ*). Consequently the word "*nāśa*" denotes disappearance i.e. a stage when a thing becomes imperceptible to the sense-organs. Moreover, when atoms (of a substance) are disjoined and separated, they are not seen by eyes as they are beyond Sense-Perception. When they join each other again and assume the character of a gross state, they become visible, because a gross substance alone is perceptible to sense-organs. When a substance is so continuously divided and subdivided that it becomes impossible to divide it further, those (last and final) divisions are termed as *Paramāṇus* (atoms). They thus subdivided become imperceptible but continue to exist in the void space.

Similarly, when a thing is put into fire it is disintegrated and continues to exist in some other region. It never ceases to exist. In this manner, the fragrant ingredients which are potent in removing all defects such as offensive odour, when are consumed in fire, they purify the air as well as the rain-water. When they are pure and free from defects, they bring about happiness and benefit to the entire creation.

For this reason, performance of a *Yajña* is obligatory.

Q. If the sole aim of a Sacrifice is the purification of air and the rain-water, (it is useless to perform a Sacrifice as) this object can be achieved by keeping fragrant articles at dwelling places. What is the advantage of this whole fuss ?

A. No, this will not do. In this manner, the impure air (inside the house) can not become lighter and thus would not ascend into the sky, but would continue to remain where it exists and thus would not create vacuum for the external purer air to come in. Moreover, the disease—averting purpose can also not be achieved because of the simultaneous existence of pure and foul air (in the house side by side).

When in the house, fragrant and similar other substances be consumed in the fire, the air due to the heat expands, grows lighter and goes up higher into the sky. At this, the pure air would get vacuum to run in from all the four directions. As by this process the space inside the house is surcharged with pure air, it has desease-destroying effect also.

(Moreover) the air, carrying the atoms of fragrant ingredients by a *Yajña* would ascend into the higher regions and would purify the rain-water as well as also it would enhance the amount of rain. By this (pure rain) herbs etc., also become pure (i.e. qualitative). By and by the world is restored to immense happiness. It is beyond all doubts. This aim cannot be achieved by making the air fragrant without its contact with fire.

Hence, the performance of *Yajña* is dccidedly beneficial.

Moreover, when a person consumes fragrant articles in the sacrificial fire, the wind carrying the (sweet) smell comes in contact with the nose-organ of a person sitting at a very far off place. He, then (at a distant station) realises the existence of the fragrant wind. From this, it is inferred that good or bad odour is vafted away by the blowing breeze. When it (fragrant air) has reached the remote region (and left the place where the Sacrifice was performed), it ceases to have contact with the smell-organ there. Here, men of immature wisdom wrongly conclude that the fragrance has perished. But they do not understand that the fragrant substances which were burnt in fire, do actually exist in the air in other (higher) region. Thus there are other multiformed purposes of sacrificial performances which the wise people can rightly comprehend by proper thinking.

Q. If the purpose of performing a Sacrifice be only this much, it can be achieved by burning ingredients in fire. Then what is the use of chanting of the *Vedā-Mantras* in that act ?

A. (To meet this objection) we say that it has its own purpose to serve.

Q. What is that ?

A. As we perform a *Yajña* with our hands, perceive it with our eyes and feel (its sensational touch) with our skin, so we recite the Vedic hymns with our tongue with a view to glorify, invoke and offer our prayers unto God. (Through them) we comprehend the purpose of the Sacrifice (also). Their repeated recitation preserves the Vedic Text and makes us realise God's existence. We are (indirectly) instructed that all acts should be preceded by prayers to God. The recitation of the Vedic hymns in the Sacrifice is done only to offer these prayers throughout all its stages.

Q. What objection is there if (passages from) some other (sacred) books than the Vedas are chanted there ?

A. The above stated aim cannot be gained by reciting some other texts, because they, not being revealed by God, are not absolutely true. It must be admitted that whatever and wherever a truth is to be found, it is originated from the Vedas. Whatever false is there, it is outside the Vedas and God is not its source. On this topic Manu says :—

(22) "O Lord, (Manu) thou alone art conversant with the duties (*Kāryas*) and real meanings of the Vedas which are the words of unimaginable, unknowable and Self-existent God." (*M*. I. 3)

(23) "The four *Varṇas* (castes), the three regions, the four *Āśramas* (stages of human life), and the Past, the Future and the Present, are all accomplished by means of the Vedas." (*MS*. XII. 97)

(24) "The eternal science of the Vedas upholds the whole creation and is a medium of securing bliss for the living beings ; hence I admit its highest place." (*MS*. XII. 99)

---

(22) "त्वमेको ह्यस्य सर्वस्य विधानस्य स्वयम्भुवः ।
अचिन्त्यस्याप्रमेयस्य कार्य-तत्त्वार्थवित्-प्रभो ।।" (*M*. I.3)

(23) "चातुर्वर्ण्यं त्रयो लोकाः चत्वारश्चाश्रमाः पृथक् ।
भूतं भव्यं भविष्यच्च सर्वं वेदात् प्रसिद्धयति ।।" (*MS*. XII. 97)

(24) "बिभर्ति सर्वभूतानि वेदशास्त्रं सनातनम् ।
तस्मादेतत् परं मन्ये यज्जन्तोरस्य साधनम् ।।" (*MS*. XII. 99)

Q. Is it essential for the performance of a Sacrifice (*Yajña*) to prepare a sacrificial altar (*Vedi*) by digging the earth, (construct a *Yajña-śālā*), (procure) the sacrificial vessels e.g. *Praṇītā* etc., and *Kuśa* grass and (to appoint) Sacrificial priests (*Ṛtvijs*) ?

A. Here our contention is that whatever is essential and reasonable that must be done and nothing else. For instance, by digging the ground, a *Vedi* is to be prepared. Fire kindled there, becomes powerful. Things thrown into it, becoming at once disintegrated ascend into the sky. Moreover, by preparing these various types of *Vedis* such as triangular, quadrangular, circular and falcon-shaped, the knowledge of Geometry is acquired. As the particular number of bricks is required for the particular type of the *Vedi*, Science of Mathematics is also learnt by this*.

---

* Prof. A.A, Mecdonell in his "INDIA'S PAST" says :—

"The beginnings of geometry go back to a period of high antiquity in India, for a considerable amount of geometrical knowledge is to be found in the *Śulva-Sūtras*, or 'String Rules', which from a part of the general Vedic ritual (*Kalpa*) *Sūtra* works. These give the rules for the laying out of the sacrificial ground, for the construction of the fire-altars, and other arrangements necessary for the performance of the single great sacrifices. The design of the sacrificial ground with its most important constituent parts made the construction of right angles, squares, and circles, as well as the transformation of plane figures into others of equal area, a matter of necessity. To sacrificial experts it was of the utmost moment that the measurement of the sacrificial ground by means of cords (*Śulva*), stretched between stakes, should be carried out accurately according to rule. These practical requirements resulted in a considerable aggregate of geometrical knowledge, including the Pythagorean proposition (worked out in Euclid 1.47). Thus the ritual experts understood how to transform rectangles into squares, squares into circles, as well as vice versa. It is probable that such geometrical knowledge based on practical operations goes back even to the time of the Vedic hymns." (Page. 192)

Prof. A.B. Kieth also confirms this view in his famous work "A History of Sanskrit Literature" :— (Contd.)

Similarly other things serve their own purposes. But some say that "the placing of a *Praṇīta* in a particular way produces religious merit (*Puṇya*) and to place it in any other way brings sin". This statement is imaginary and false ; because there is no cause of sin. (Hence there is no sin). Whatever, is essential for the accomplishment of a Sacrifice and is reasonable, that must be provided ; because if these things or acts are left aside, there can be no success.

(Contd. from page 74)

"In one sphere, however, distinctly interesting results were attained in geometry as a result of the care taken in the measurement of altars. These results are enshrined in the *Çulvasūtras,* works which are of the late Sūtra period, possibly of c. 200 B.C., though this is mere guesswork. They are concerned with the construction of squares and rectangles ; the relation of the diagonal to the sides ; the equivalence of rectangles and squares ; and the construction of equivalent squares and circles." (Page 517)

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DEVATĀS

Q. What is denoted by the word "*Devatā*" in a Sacrifice ?

A. Those objects, which are stated in the Vedas (are called *Devatās*). The pieces of evidence are as follows :—

(1) "Agni is Devatā, *Vāta* is Devatā, *Sūrya* is Devatā, *Candramas* is Devatā, *Vasus* are Devatās, *Rudras* are Devatās, *Ādityas* are Devatās, *Maruts* are Devatās, *Viśvedevās* are Devatās, *Bṛhaspati* is Devatā, *Indra* is Devatā and *Varuṇa* is Devatā." (*YV*. XIV. 20)

Here, in the realm of ritualism (*Karma-kāṇḍa*), the word *Devatā* denotes the "Vedic Mantras". Vedic stanzas (composed in) metres such as *Gāyatrī* etc. are given the names of *Agni Devatā* and others. They are accepted here ; because they expound the various methods of doing a ritual act. The stanza, which reveals the significance of the word of *Agni* is styled to have *Agni* as its *Devatā*. Similarly, the Mantras explaining the meanings of the words, *Vāta*, *Sūrya*, *Candramas*, *Varuṇa*, *Vasus*, *Rudras*, *Ādityas*, *Maruts*, *Viśvedevās*, *Bṛhaspati* and *Indra* are called to possess these substances for their *Devatās* ; because these Mantras elucidate all such words and in them we get references to these substances made by most creditable authority of God.

On this point, Ācārya Yāska in his Nirukta observes :—

(2) "The Vedas contain Mantras (which explain) the accomplishment of actions." (*N*. I. 2)

(3) "The *Daivata* (chapter) is so called as it contains appellations of *Devatās* to whom primary praise is offered."

---

(1) "अग्निर्देवता वातो देवता सूर्यो देवता चन्द्रमा देवता वसवो देवता रुद्रा देवताऽऽदित्या देवता मरुतो देवता विश्वेदेवा देवता बृहस्पतिर्देवतेन्द्रो देवता वरुणो देवता ।" (*YV*. XIV, 20)

(2) "कर्मसम्पत्तिर्मन्त्रो वेदे ।" (*N*. I. 2)

(3) "अथातो दैवतम् । तद्यानि नामानि प्राधान्यस्तुतीनां देवतानां तद्दैवतमित्याचक्षते । सैषा देवतोपपरीक्षा । यत्काम ऋषिर्यस्यां देवतायामार्थपत्यमिच्छन् स्तुतिं प्रयुङ्क्ते, तद्दैवतः स मन्त्रो भवति ।

तास्त्रिविधा ऋचः परोक्षकृताः प्रत्यक्षकृता आध्यात्मिक्यश्च ॥" (*N*. VII. 1)

Here is the detailed examination of the *Devatās* :—

> When a Seer desirous of a particular object praises a *Devatā* (i.e. a Mantra, knowing it as) possessing that object, that Mantra is said to have that (particular) *Devatā*. Such Mantras (*Ṛcas*) are of three kinds (I) those whose meaning is direct, (II) those where the meaning is indirect and (III) those relating to spiritual science."* (*N*. VII. 1)

---

* These passages from the *Nirukta* cited by our author in support of his view that "the Vedic Mantras are the *Devatās*," have been translated here above by us in accordance with his interpretation. This dynamical rendering is worth-appreciation. We also write below the traditional translation of these passages. All commentators, including Durga, have accepted it :—

> "Now the *Daivata Kāṇḍa* : They style this (chapter) as *Daivata* as it contains appellations (of deties) to whom primary praise is offered (i.e. a list of words beginning with *Agni* and ending with *Devapatnī*).
>
> Now follows the detailed test of *Devatās*.
>
> When a Seer desirous of (achieving) a particular object glorifies a particular *Devatā* (a deity) knowing him as possessor of that (desired) substance (*Arthapati*) (with a Mantra) that stanza (Mantra) is said to have that particular *Devatā*."
>
> (*N*. VII. 1)

The well known commentator Durgācārya explains these passages as follows :—

(s) "यानि नामानि प्राधान्यस्तुतीनामग्न्यादीनां देवपत्न्यन्तानां देवतानां तद्दैवतं प्रकरणमित्येवमाचार्या आचक्षते । निरूढा ह्ययमेतस्मिन् प्रकरणे संज्ञेत्यभिप्रायः । ··· ··· प्राधान्यस्तुतिभाञ्जि यानि देवताभिधानानि तत् समुदायो दैवतं प्रकरणम् ।."

i.e. "In short a chapter containing appellations of *Devatās* to whom primary praise is offered is called *Daivata*."

(b), "यत्-अर्थवस्तु, कामयमानः ऋषिः, यस्यां देवतायामभिष्टुतायाम्, आर्थपत्यम्-अर्थपतिभावमात्मन इच्छन् अमुष्या देवतायाः प्रसादेनाहममुष्यार्थस्य पतिः

(Contd.)

(Contd, from page 77)

भविष्यामि इति बुद्धि पुरोधाय स्तुतिं प्रयुङ्क्ते तद्दैवतः स मन्त्रो भवति । ...
...अथवा देवतायामस्यार्थस्येयं देवता दातुं समर्था इति जानानः स्तुतिं प्रयुङ्क्ते
येन मन्त्रेण सा प्राधान्यस्तुतिभाग्देवता ॥"

We according to this interpretation of Durgācarya have translated the above passages in the foot note here. Yāska divides *Devatās* in three categories (I) *Pratyakṣa-kṛta,* (II) *Parokṣa-kṛta,* (III) *Ādhyātmikyas.*

These three titles of *Devatās* have been translated by us here as (I) the Mantras, having clear meaning, (II) *Mantras,* where the meaning is not obvious, (III) and Mantras containing spiritual science But this interpretation is not in accordance with what Yāska has said. He defines these terms as follows :—

(a) "परोक्षकृताः सर्वाभिः नामविभक्तिभिः युज्यन्ते प्रथमपुरुषैश्चाख्यातस्य ।"
i.e. *Ṛcas* which contain words used in all cases and verbs used in Third Person are called 'परोक्षकृताः' ।

(b) प्रत्यक्षकृता मध्यमपुरुषयोगास्त्वमिति चैतेन सर्वनाम्ना ।"

i.e. Mantras containing Pronoun "*Tvam*" in Second Person are termed as प्रत्यक्षकृताः ॥

(c) "उत्तमपुरुषयोगा अहमिति चैतेन सर्वनाम्ना ।"

i.e. *Ādhyātmikya* Mantras are those which contain First Personal Pronoun "*Aham*".

But Dayānanda seems to have not followed the traditional translation or the definitions of these terms given by Yāska himself. We may add here that this topic has a number of intricate problems and controversies. No book including *Sarvānukramaṇīs* and *Bṛhaddevatā* can give final verdict on this topic. Hence Veṅkaṭa Mādhava, the commentator of Ṛgveda has clearly shown his helplessness to give final word in the matter of "*Devatā-vāda*" in his *Devatānukramaṇī* :—

"देवतातत्त्वविज्ञानं महता तपसा भवेत् ।
शक्यते तत् किमस्माभिः याथातथ्येन भाषितुम् ॥"

Only the Seers like Vasiṣṭa and Dayānanda can rightly ascertain the *Devatā* of a particular stanza or hymn as is clear from the undernoted citation from the *Bṛhaddevatā* :— (Contd.)

That is to say when a Vedic Stanza comprehensively describes the methods of securing success and accomplishment in all actions (beginning with) *Agni-Hotra* (Fire Sacrifice) to *Aśva-medha* (a Sacrifice for protection of *Rāṣṭra* or nation) or actions which promote arts and other sciences, that Mantra is technically styled as "*Devatā*". Similarly when a Mantra describes actions leading to "Release" or Union with God, it as well as its import is also called a *Devatā*. Now we say what a *Devatā* is. The *Devatās* enjoying the primary praise (i.e. forming the chief subject matter) are called *Daivatas*. The names of substances (*Arthas*) occurring in a Mantra serve as a mark or indication of a Devatā. For instance in the following Mantra of the Yajurveda, the word *Agni* occurs :—

(4) "I set *Agni*, the Envoy, in the front. I eulogise Him as the bearer of the oblations. May He cause the *Devas* (i.e. the learned) to sit here." (*YV*. XXII. 17)

Here the word *Agni* is an indication or a mark (to which *Devatā*, this stanza belongs). What is its significance ? Wherever a Devatā is spoken of (i.e. is to be determined), there we should take into consideration the mark or indication, occurring in a Mantra i.e. the name of a substance, occurring in a stanza is the *Devatā* of that Mantra.

A part of the test (of finding out) *Devatā* (in a Mantra) has already been explained ; the rest will be elucidated now. God is (here) Seer—the All Observer—. When He, desirous of imparting instructions about a *Devatā* (i.e. an object) which possesses particular qualities (*Ārthapatyam-Arthasya Svāmitvam*) describes its properties, that Mantra is said to have

---

(Contd. from page 78)

"न प्रत्यक्षमनृषेरस्ति मन्त्रम् ।"

"योगेन दाक्ष्येण दमेन बुद्ध्या, बाहुश्रुत्येन तपसा नियोगैः ॥
उपास्यास्ताः कृत्स्नशो देवताः ॥" (*BD*. VIII. 129, 130)

i.e. "Only the Seer can rightly understand the Vedic text." "These Devatās (i.e. subject matters) of stanzas can be determined by a person who is strong in meditation, *Brahmacarya* and other austerities. Mere learning has no power to solve this question."

(4) "अ॒ग्निं दू॒तं पु॒रो द॑धे हव्य॒वाह॒मुप॑ब्रुवे ।
दे॒वाँ२ऽआ॒सा॑दयादि॒ह ॥" (*YV*. XXII. 17)

It also occurs in *ṚV*. VIII. 44.3.

that object as its *Devatā*. Moreover, the Mantra itself which lucidly explains or reveals a certain object, is also given the name of *Devatā*. The word *Ṛcas* is derived from the root "√*Ṛk*" to praise. *Ṛcas* have been given the term of "*Devatā*" because the learned eulogise and explain through them all true sciences.

These revealed Mantras are of three kinds (I) *Parokṣa kṛtas* i.e. those Mantras where meaning is not obvious, (II) the *Pratyakṣa kṛtas* i.e. where the meaning is quite obvious, and (III) *Ādhyātmikyas* i.e. those Mantras which describe the spiritual science – the soul and the all pervading God.*

These *Ṛcas* in ritual or action-portion (*Karma-Kāṇḍa*) of the Vedas are denoted by the word *Devatā*.

(Yāska further says in his *Nirukta*) :—

(5) "Now we give a test of finding out Devatās in the Mantras where they are not expressly specified. These Mantras belong to the Devatā of the *Yajña* (where they are recited) or that of its component part. According to the *Yājñikas*, Mantras not used

---

* The definitions of these technical words, in accordance with Yāska have already been given in our foot-note.

(5) "तद् येऽनादिष्टदेवतामन्त्रास्तेषु देवतोपपरीक्षा ।
यद्देवतः स यज्ञो यज्ञाङ्गं वा तद्देवता भवन्ति । अथान्यत्र यज्ञात् प्राजापत्या इति याज्ञिकाः । नाराशंसा इति नैरुक्ताः । अपि वा सा कामदेवता स्यात् । प्रायो देवता वा । अस्ति ह्याचारो बहुलं लोके—देवदेवत्यमतिथिदेवत्यं पितृदेवत्यं याज्ञदैवतो मन्त्र इति ।" (*N.* VII. 4)

Here some words are technical and need explanation. The author of the *Nirukta* means to say that it is not very easy to determine a *Devatā* in those stanzas where it is not expressly specified or indicated. He, therefore, gives some alternative suggestions for determining *Devatā* in such cases. According to him, "*Anādiṣṭa Devatā-mantras*" (stanzas with obscure unexpressed Devatās) may be assigned to the undermentioned *Devatās* :—

(1) Devatā of the Sacrifice or that of its component part. That is to say that *Devatā* can be determined with reference to the context. For instance, if a Stanza is recited in particular Sacrifice, the Devatā of the Sacrifice should be deemed as the *Devatā* of that Stanza. (Contd.)